THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

An Antonia James Devoted of Barre

Astron

A No. 1

Price State

Contributors To This Issue

- WHILIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN, foreign correspondent in Soviet Russia for the Christian Science Monitor, 1922-1933, is the author of well-known works on the Soviet Union, of which the latest is The Russian Enlyma.
- World Settlement and known throughout the world for his system of contract bridge, is the son of an American Mining Engineer and of Contract Bridge, is the son of an American Mining Engineer and of Contack General's daughter; the story of his extraordinarily varied life was told in his autobiography, The Strange Lives of One Man.
- DORIS B. BOGOSLOVSKY, philosopher and educator, is author of The Technique of Controversy: Principles of Dynamic Logic, 1928 and The Ideal School, 1936.
- MARK ALDANOV is recognized as one of the foremost contemporary Russian povelists; his latest novel, The Fifth Stal, was a Book of the Month Club selection in 1943.
- VI ADIMTR NABOROV is a distinguished Russian novelist and poet, recipient of a Guggenheim Memorial Foundation Fellowship and a frequent contributor to the Atlantic Monthly; his latest book is a milliant study of Nikolai Gogel (1944).
- SANDOMIRSKY is a poet and critic; after studying literature philology in many European universities, she came to this countries in 1940 and has cince taught English and lectured on Russian literature, while contributing to Books Abroad, Italica, and Poetry.
 - M. O. ZETLIN, Russian writer and poet is the author of The Decembrists: The Fate of One Generation, 1933 and The Five and Others, 1944 (both in Russian) and editor of the Navyi Zhurnal, a Russian review published in New York.
 - ARTHUR PRUDDEN COLEMAN is Associate Professor of Slavic and East European Languages at Columbia University, Chairman of the Slavonic Group, Modern Language Association of America, and Secretary of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages.
 - RAYMOND H. FISHER is Associate Professor of History in Humboldt State College in California and is the author of The Russian Ray Trade, 2550-2700, 1943.

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

An American Journal Devoted to Russia Past and Present

Vol. 4	AUTUMN 1944	No. 1
	* * *	
Russia and Europe, 1918	-1944, William Henry Chamberl	in 3
Russia and World Securi	ity, Ely Culbertson	10
The Genius of the Russia	in Language, Boris B. Bogoslovsk	ży 18
	Kansas, Mark Aldanov	
	(Translations), Vladimir Nabo	
	Sandomirsky	
	(Translated by Olga Oushakoff)	
The Teaching of Russian	n in the United States,	
Arthur Prudden Col	eman	83
	wn of Seventeenth Century Sibe	
Raymond H. Fisher		89
	BOOK REVIEWS	
anty; My Lives in I	G. R. Treviranus; USSR, by N Russia by Markoosha Fischer; R ki, Dimitri von Mohrenschildt	ussian Year
Russia and the United S Peace, by Bernard	tates, by Pitirim A. Sorokin; Ru Pares; The Road to Teheran, 1	ssia and the 781-1943 by
Foster Rhea Dulles,	Michael Karpovich	105
	William Mandell, Charles Prince	
Organization of Americ ments selected and of	ernard Newman, <i>George Waskov</i> an Relief in Europe 1918-1919. Edited <i>by</i> Suda Lorena Bane and	Docu- Ralph Has-
well Lutz, Fritz T.	Epstein	109
Intervention at Archange	el. The Story of Allied Interventi	on and Rus-
I Strakhovsky T	ution in North Russia, 1918-1920	110
The Russian Fur Trade,	, 1550-1700, by Raymond H. Fis Century, by George V. Lantzeff,	her; Siberia
		112

(Continued on page II)

People, Church and State in Modern Russia, by Paul B. Anderson, N. S. Timasheff	
Russian Cavalcade: A Military Record, by Albert Parry, Anatole G.	114
Ocherki po istorii narodnogo obrazovaniya v Rossii i SSSR, (Studies in the History of Public Education in Russia and USSR). Vol. I,	116
by Olga Kaidanova, William Henry Chamberlin	110
Alexander Kaun and Ernest J. Simmons, F. J. Whitfield	117
The Establishment of Constitutional Government in Bulgaria, by C. E. Black, A. E. Raubitschek	
The Loom of Language, by Frederick Bodmer, Peter A. Pertzoff	
Pyatero i drugie, by M. O. Zetlin; Tchaikovsky, by Herbert Weinstock; Dmitri Shostakovich, by V. I. Seroff, Arthur Lourié	122
Frossia, by Martha Almedingen; The Bells of Saint Ivan's, by Robert Spencer Carr, Helen Iswolsky	124
New Books Received	126
Errata	127

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

William Henry Chamberlin

Michael Karpovich

Dimitri von Mohrenschildt

ADVISORY EDITORIAL BOARD

James Donald Adams Stephen Duggan H. H. Fisher Waclaw Lednicki Clarence Manning Alexander Nazaroff George R. Noyes Bernard Pares Peter Pertzoff Michael Rostovtzeff Nikander Strelsky Alexander Tarsaidzé Lucy E. Textor Countess A. Tolstoy Edmund Wilson Alexis Wiren Nicholas Wreden

The aim of "The Russian Review" is to present a non-partisan interpretation of Russian history, civilization, and culture. The Review invites contributions by authors of divergent views, but the opinions expressed in any individual article in this journal are not necessarily those of the editors.

All dates pertaining to Russia prior to the introduction of the new style (Gregorian Calendar) on February 1, 1918, are according to the old style. The emblem on the cover of "The Russian Review" is an original design by M. V. Dobujinsky, representing "Alkonost," a mythical figure, half-woman, half-bird, popular in Russian folk-lore.

Copyright 1944, and published semi-annually in November and April, by "The Russian Review," 215 West 23rd Street, New York 11, N. Y. Subscription rates: \$2.00 a year in the United States; Canada \$2.20; foreign \$2.50; single copy \$1.00. The contents of this publication cannot be reprinted without the permission of the editors. Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by stamped, self-addressed envelopes.

Russia and Europe, 1918-1944

By WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

During the relatively peaceful century that elapsed between the end of the Napoleonic Wars and the outbreak of the First World War, Russia's frontier in Europe was stabilized. Apart from the annexation of part of Bessarabia after the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78, the western boundary of the Russian Empire was the same in 1914 as in 1820.

In the twentieth century, Russia, along with Europe, has been caught up in the storms of the two world wars. As a result of the First World War, the Bolshevik Revolution, and the emergence of independent states in what has been the western border provinces of the Empire, the Russian frontier was moved back from the Gulf of

Finland to the Black Sea.

0

The frontier which the Soviet Union claims at the present time to a considerable extent, although not entirely, marks a reversion to the Russian Empire border of 1914. The Baltic Republics, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, were formerly included in the Russian Empire. This was also the case as regards Bessarabia and the northern part of the territory which the Soviet Union proposes to annex from Poland. The Soviet government lays no claim to the Polish regions west of the Bug River which, with such large cities as Warsaw and Lodz, formerly belonged to Russia. Under the terms of the peace treaty which was concluded in September, Finland retains nominal independence, although within shrunken frontiers and under conditions which would seem to assure Soviet military and economic domination. Before 1914, Finland was part of the Russian Empire, but possessed certain autonomous rights.

In the case of Poland, Stalin has not, up to the present time, insisted on an integral restoration of the 1914 Russian boundary. On the other hand, he had added to the Soviet Union two regions, Eastern Galicia and Northern Bukovina, which have never belonged to Russia. Both were attached to the Austro-Hungarian Empire until its break-up. Poland then acquired Eastern Galicia, and Rumania

took over Northern Bukovina.

The contrast between Russia's relation to Europe after the last war and after the present conflict goes deeper than the circumstance that Russia will apparently regain most of the territory which was lost and annex some new regions. There is an immense difference in Russian national power, as between 1918 and 1944. And there are also important differences in Soviet policies, methods, and immediate aims.

In some respects there is a strong similarity between the German position in southeastern Europe in the autumn of 1918 and in the present autumn. In both years what had been a fairly complete military hegemony was beginning to crumble. Bulgaria's abandonment of the Teutonic cause twice played the rôle of a falling barometer in relation to German military prospects.

But in 1918 all the pressure against Germany, in the East as in the West, was coming from the Western allies. It was a predominantly French army, based on Salonika, that knocked Bulgaria out

of the war.

When the First World War came to an end, Russia was at the lowest ebb of national power since the Times of Trouble and was incapable of influencing the general European settlement, except indirectly, through its new weapon of revolutionary propaganda. There was a time in the summer of 1918 when the area under the control of the Soviet government was comparable with that of the medieval Grand Duchy of Moscow. The Germans were in the western borderlands, in the Ukraine, the Don, the Caucasus. The Allies had sent expeditionary forces to Archangel, Murmansk, and Vladivostok. The Czecho-Slovak corps, in cooperation with local anti-Soviet forces, had wrested from Soviet control a large area in the Volga, the Urals, and Siberia.

Russia was ravaged by civil war and decimated by hunger and disease. Years of further exhausting struggle lay ahead, before the Soviet régime could establish its unquestioned authority over most of

the area which had formerly belonged to the Empire.

Yet even when Russia was weakest, in terms of material power, when its new Red Army was raw and poorly equipped, when its industry and its railways were paralyzed, when its people were cold and hungry, it was a formidable threat to the existing order in Europe. For the idea of communism possessed a dynamic appeal to warweary masses not only in Russia, but all over Europe.

Even the countries that had suffered least experienced waves of strikes, sometimes accompanied by riots, in the immediate aftermath of the war. There were episodes of outright civil war in Germany, in Hungary, in Finland. Naturally the countries that were hungriest and that had suffered most during the war were most susceptible to the new revolutionary agitation.

Moscow in this early phase of the Soviet régime prided itself on being "the capital of the world revolution." Lenin and Trotsky, the most prominent figures in the Soviet government, were also the acknowledged leaders of the Communist International, which held its first conference in 1919, in response to an invitation sent out by

the Soviet Commissariat for Foreign Affairs.

If the abstract idea of communism was a stimulus to some European workers, the ideal of world revolution also operated powerfully on the mind and hope and imagination of the Russian Communists. One of the dramatic episodes in Russia's little known civil war occurred at the Eighth Congress of the Communist Party, held in March, 1919. The Soviet armies were engaged in a hard struggle with Kolchak in the East and Denikin in the South. Internal problems of food and fuel supply were urgent, as always. In the midst of the deliberations at the Congress, a message was read to the effect that a Soviet government had been set up in Hungary. A scene of the wildest enthusiasm followed. It seemed that a window had been broken in the interventionist wall.

Lenin sent detailed political advice to the Hungarian Communist régime, which was headed by Bela Kun. And the Red Army tried to come to the aid of the hard pressed Hungarian Soviet Republic by striking at Rumania. As it happened, however, just at this time, in the spring of 1919, there was a wave of peasant uprisings in the Ukraine against the precariously established Soviet régime. The situation on the main military fronts, against Kolchak and Denikin, became so serious that the idea of bringing aid to Hungary had to be

abandoned.

However, there can be no serious question of the historical fact that at this time the Soviet government considered its fate closely bound up with that of the international revolutionary movement. The balance of material strength would have been strongly against the new and struggling Soviet system if the Western powers had decided to go over from irresolute and half-hearted aid to the anti-Bolshevik forces to all-out war and intervention. Communist revolutions in one or more European countries would have changed this balance.

So Lenin and the other Communist leaders made every effort to

give the struggle against intervention the character of a revolutionary crusade. While there was an upsurge of Russian nationalist feeling when the Polish armies advanced to Kiev in the spring of 1920 and General Brusilov and other Tsarist officers voluntarily offered their services to the Red Army, the official Communist propaganda remained internationalist in character. The war was presented not as a Russo-Polish conflict, but as a struggle against the "Polish pans,"

or aristocrats.

When Lord Curzon, then British Foreign Minister, suggested as an armistice demarcation boundary a line following the course of the Bug River, at a time when the Soviet armies were driving on Warsaw in July, 1920, the Soviet government rejected the proposal with the rather surprising observation that this line would be too unfavorable to Poland. At the same time it made armistice proposals to Poland providing for the arming of the workers and the demobilization of the regular Polish army, proposals, which, if they had been accepted, would have most probably led to the setting up of a Soviet state in Poland. There is a fairly well authenticated story that Lenin, after throwing his influence on the side of the drive for Warsaw, said:

"We shall break the crust of Polish bourgeois resistance with the

bayonets of the Red Army."

In retrospect it is evident that the Soviet government in 1920 threw away the opportunity to obtain a more favorable frontier with Poland on the gamble that Poland could be turned into a Communist state. The remarkable display of generosity in connection with the Polish frontier was, of course, based on the theory that Poland would become a member of the Soviet Federation.

After 1921 there was a gradual abatement of the feeling that the Russian Revolution must either inspire similar movements in other countries or face ultimate defeat. Both the Allied attempts at intervention, and the Soviet attempts to promote the emergence of Soviet régimes in other countries had failed. Europe emerged from the more acute phase of postwar crisis, a phase favorable to revolutionary agitation. The great powers one by one resumed diplomatic and commercial relations with the Soviet Union.

For the last five years Europe has been harried and torn up by a second great war, still more cruel and destructive than its predecessor. From 1921 until 1939 Russia's relations with Europe had been stabilized, although on an uneasy and precarious basis, with little genuine confidence on either side. There were no armed conflicts, no

frontier changes.

But Hitler's attack on Poland from the West in September, 1939, was quickly followed by a Soviet occupation of Eastern Poland. Soviet relations with Europe were again in the melting pot, and are

still in a distinctly fluid state.

There are two striking contrasts between the Russia of 1918 and the Russia of 1944. The revolutionary Russia of 1918 was unable to make its voice heard in the postwar territorial settlement. The Russia of 1944 is dictating the new political contours of Europe from the Arctic Ocean to the Black Sea.

In 1918, 1919, 1920 Moscow was visited mainly by hunted revolutionaries. Recently it has been receiving deputations from the smaller countries that fought along with Germany against the Soviet Union and have been knocked out of the war: Finland, Rumania, Bulgaria. The armed force that is driving the Germans from the Balkans is predominantly Russian, not British or French. This fact cannot remain without political implications.

Now it is easy to imagine what Lenin would have done if he had possessed a powerful, well equipped, well disciplined Red Army to hurl into hungry, chaotic, disorganized Eastern and Central Europe. He would have used this army as a potent instrument of revolution.

This is what he did, without success, in Poland, in the Baltic States, in Finland, and with success in Georgia, Azerbaidian, Bokhara. These remote non-Russian and non-industrial regions of the former Empire would not have adhered to the Communist cause without prodding from the centrally organized Red Army. It is debatable whether the Ukraine could have been held with purely Ukrainian forces during the period of civil war.

The full pattern of Soviet policy in Eastern Europe will not unfold until Germany has been completely defeated. It would be premature to say that all dreams of revolutionary transformation have

been permanently abandoned.

But there has been remarkably little social-revolutionary quality about the military exploits of the Red Army up to the present time. American correspondents who visited regions of Rumania under occupation by Soviet troops reported that there had been no-interference with existing laws and economic relations, only a routine military occupation.

Soviet propaganda since the German attack has consistently played down the revolutionary note. Appeals to the Balkan peoples have been phrased along nationalist lines, with occasional infusions of PanSlavism. Neither enemies nor prospective allies have been urged to set up Soviets. The Free Germany Committee and the Union of Polish Patriots, the organizations in Moscow which are largely responsible for propaganda messages beamed to Germany and to Poland, have been calling for democratic, not Communist political forms. Soviet political and economic institutions have been imposed only in regions which are marked for outright annexation. Even the existing monarchies in Rumania and Bulgaria have not been swept away as a result of the military occupation of those countries by Soviet troops. This would have been unthinkable if such an occupation had taken place twenty or twenty-five years ago.

To be sure, Stalin is an expert in maneuvre. Both in domestic and in foreign policy he has often displayed a marked capacity to wait for the achievement of a desired end. A blueprint for the eventual Sovietization of the wide area which is apparently to become a Soviet sphere of influence after the war may conceivably be held in reserve. Consideration for the feelings of Russia's Western allies, recognition of the need for a transition period may account for the present moderate Soviet attitude toward existing institutions in occupied regions.

n

0

0

However, there may well be a deeper reason for the absence of visible missionary zeal in present day Soviet policy. The Soviet régime has now existed for twenty-seven years. Historical experience in general, and the example of the French Revolution in particular, would indicate that it is difficult, if not impossible, to maintain an original revolutionary faith at a white heat of fanaticism over so long a period.

Social relations in Russia were turned upside down in the most thoroughgoing fashion in the first phase of the Revolution. It was a badge of honor to have served a long prison sentence under the Tsarist régime. Children of persons who had formerly enjoyed posts or titles of honor did everything to conceal this damning evidence of undesirable "class origin," which debarred them from higher education and jobs in the Soviet state service. To be of working class or poor peasant origin was to possess a passport to official favor.

Now society has become more stratified. New classes based, to be sure, on function rather than on birth or wealth, are emerging. The special favors shown to workers, the disabilities imposed upon the "bourgeoisie" have disappeared. Soviet state capitalism imposes a discipline more severe, if one may judge from many Soviet laws and regulations, than private capitalism could conceivably enforce in modern times.

Under such circumstances the psychological climate is not favorable to all-out revolutionary propaganda on the early Bolshevik model. It would not be surprising, as the European postwar pattern unfolds, to find more spontaneous revolutionary spirit in some of the countries that have been impoverished, embittered, radicalized by years of war and foreign occupation than in Russia.

It is also interesting to note that Soviet war aims in Europe today are remarkably similar to those of Tsarist Russia in the last war, aims which every Bolshevik orator in 1917 denounced as impreg-

nated with the evil spirit of imperialism.

There is very little that the Soviet government has done in Eastern Europe that a strongly nationalist Russian government might not have done, perhaps with minor changes of technique and phrase-ology. It would be dangerous to predict the evolution of any country's foreign policy for eternity. But for the immediate future nationalist ambitions seem likely to outweigh crusading internationalism in creating issues as between Russia and its European neighbors, on one hand, and Russia and its Western allies, on the other.

Russia and World Security

By ELY CULBERTSON

One can draw two conclusions from Russia's attitude at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference: 1. Russia has no faith in the efficacy of the proposed revived League of Nations as a system of collective security. 2. Russia is determined that the revived League shall not be used again as a screen for the power politics of the capitalistic states. Her bitter disillusionment with the League type of collective security has long been apparent, and during the Dumbarton Oaks Conference it was but thinly disguised behind glittering generalities. Pravda called the League a "ghost," and the In-

ternational Labor Organization a "bankrupt" organization.

Considering the cynical treatment accorded to Russia in the past, no one can blame her for such an attitude. If Russia had any faith in the "Big Four" League, she would not have hamstrung it by insisting on an ironclad provision that each of the Big Four states may veto any action of the League Council against any aggressor, even though such an aggressor be one of the Big Four states themselves. This provision obviously defeats the very purpose of the League, which is collective defense against any aggression. The same right to veto any action of the League serves the purpose of preventing possible future combines of capitalistic countries from using the League to brand Russia before the court of world public opinion as an aggressor.

tl

S

tl

T

th

to

01

st

Does all this mean that Russia has no hope for any effective system of collective security, and is merely paying lip service to the needs of internal politics of the statesmen of her Anglo-American allies? Does it mean that the leaders of Soviet Russia, secretly imbued with communistic messianism, are craftily calculating that in another fifteen years Soviet Russia will become industrially and militarily powerful enough to spread her ideology by fire and sword? And that today, therefore, Russia seeks to expand in eastern Europe and in Asia only as far as she can without crystallizing a world coalition against her, in the expectation that later she will lead a world proletarian coalition against the Anglo-American bulwark of capital-

ism? Finally, does it mean that Russia's alliance with Britain, in which a partition of Europe and therefore of Asia might be implicit, is simply a temporary maneuvre to avert a possible Anglo-American coalition—those Anglo-Americans who are still tremendously powerful and who, in control of the seas and the air of the world, might still crush Russia under the leadership of reactionary forces?

My answer is, no. In fact, the foregoing questions almost answer themselves and demonstrate that an effective and politically acceptable system of real collective defense is, if anything, more essential for the survival of Soviet Russia than even for the eventual survival

of the British Empire and the United States.

In order to understand why this is so, and what kind of system of collective security Russia seeks and will accept, it is necessary to explain the geopolitical and historical factors dominating the Russia of yesterday and today, particularly in relation to the United States. In my book, Total Peace, I have discussed precisely these factors.

Most Americans have heard too much about Russian ideology and not enough about Russian geography. Communist ideology has shaped the life of the Russian people during this generation only. Geography, or geopolitics, has shaped the body and the soul of this

Nordic-Slav race for thousands of years.

Geopolitically, Russia is a gigantic, irregular saucer with a large wedge, the one facing Europe, chipped off. Russian history is three inter-woven epics: the struggle to fill up the heartland of the Eurasian world island, the struggle to dam the broken edge against invaders from the west, and the struggle to climb up the southern rim of the saucer. In the same way that a branch of the Anglo-Saxons, thrown off across the Atlantic from England, grew into the United States, a branch of the Eastern Slavs, thrown off into the forests of the north and steppes of the east, formed the Great Russia of today. To occupy their plains the Americans had to displace a few hundred thousand Indians. The Russians fought against scores of nomadic tribes, all of which they destroyed or absorbed. By the early twentieth century, Russia had completed most of her gigantic task. The vast Eurasian plain was filling up peacefully at the rate of thirty million every decade. The great mountains in the south, from the Black Sea to the Himalayas, were securely in her possession and she was edging her way through Turkestan to the frontiers of India. In the Pacific, Manchuria and Port Arthur were annexed. There remained only Constantinople to be taken, and the Russian Colossus could stand fully astride both Europe and Asia.

But in Germany the Industrial Revolution was laying time bombs which were to explode the heartland of Russia in 1914 and again in 1941. The Japanese militarists were coldly measuring the corruption and impotence of the Russian caste of nobles. In Russia itself a small group of unkempt idealists were passionately debating a *system* for the Liberation of Russia and mankind. They were system mongers,

as there are war mongers.

The most momentous of these debates was the one between Lenin and the orthodox "evolutionary Marxists." Lenin maintained that even in industrially ripe countries a resort to force was indispensable in order to establish a proletarian state. He scorned the opposing socialist school who believed that a proletarian state could fall into their lap like a ripe fruit, in accordance with Marxian laws of economic evolution. In 1903, at a conference held in London, began that split in the ranks of the Russian Social Democrats which eventually resulted in the formation of a separate Bolshevik Party headed

by Lenin.

Within the same year, and in the same city of London, the British geographer, Sir Halford Mackinder, expounded the basic principles of geopolitics, proclaiming his theory of the world island, which is a single supercontinent formed from the three continents of Europe, Asia, and Africa. He spoke of Russia as occupying in Europe and Asia the heartland of the world island, which is the geographical pivot of history. And he wrote: "Who rules eastern Europe commands the heartland. Who rules the heartland commands the world island. Who commands the world island rules the world." Twenty years later, the father of German geopolitics, Major General and Professor Karl Haushofer, was to implant this idea in the febrile mind of Hitler, who would make it the basis of the German foreign policy of Lebensraum and world conquest. And Lenin's successor, Stalin, would clash with Hitler in the greatest battles of history, in the heartland of Russia.

f

tl

S

fr

h

tv

g

E

th

Not ideology but power politics has been the key to Stalin's extremely brilliant military-political activities of the last twenty years. Stalin was defending Russia first and foremost, in spite of the jeers, groans, and vituperation of both the reactionaries and many liberals.

There was the iron necessity of preparation for defense in a war that seemed inevitable. Stalin met the threat from the outside by a tremendously intensified militarization and industrialization of Russia. A nation of peasants became a nation of mechanics. The Russian Army was first to be really mechanized, and its leaders were first to

realize the implications of the fact that the industrial potential had become equal to the military potential. Those who followed the evolution of Russia under Stalin were not surprised at the caliber of Russia's resistance to Hitler. As early as the late 1930s, the Russian High Command had planned the military defense of Russia not only against Germany, but also against an assumed hostile coalition of entire Europe. Even then they were preparing to withdraw, if need be, behind the Volga, where new industries were being developed. In their plans it was going to be a very long war, until Europe should be worn out and dissension should break up the coalition.

The Communist International, originally conceived in the feverish wild hopes of the revolutionary millennium that right after the First World War seemed to be just around the corner, became in Stalin's hands a powerful weapon of military defense against the constant threat of a capitalist coalition. In every country the local Communist Party, behind its broad ideological facade, was an advance legion of militant scouts and guerrilla workers. It did not take Stalin long to discover that even if the Bolshevik millennium was still a millennium off, the strikes, dissensions, and armed outbreaks were a powerful weapon to use inside any potential enemy country. During the Second World War, the Communist International ceased to be useful and, in fact, hampered the power politics of the Russian state. It was abandoned.

Stalin became the greatest isolationist in history. His concept of the Russian state as a model socialist state did not rule out concern for the rest of the world, but it did make preservation of the Soviet Union the primary aim for Communism not only in Russia but over the world.

The history of the remainder of the twentieth century will be written around Russia and the United States. Throughout the world there is no single point of friction between Russia and the United States in trade, economic expansion, or territorial ambitions. Instead, from the standpoint of purely selfish interest, Russia and America have much in common to defend. The geopolitical patterns of the two countries are strikingly similar. Russia is the heartland of the great Eurasian island; the United States is the heartland of the Western Hemisphere. Russia lies at the continental crossroads of Europe and Asia; the United States lies at the oceanic crossroads of the Atlantic and Pacific. Like the United States, Russia is threatened by the Europeans and the Asiatics; and similarly, the vital nerve centers of Russia are thousands of miles away from the European

and Asiatic powers. The future of Russia, like that of America, is under a heavy cloud from the industrial awakening of the vastly populated nations in Asia, or from a United Europe. Like the United States, Russia is seeking a workable system of collective defense in order to perpetuate possession of her magnificent share of the world.

Russia's relations with other states during the postwar period will

oscillate between two mutually repellent poles:

1. The world's fear that Soviet Russia may convert it to communism by fire and sword.

2. Soviet Russia's fear that the world may destroy its socialist

state by fire and sword.

After the destruction of Nazism, Russia remains the only great state in the world whose activities might threaten not only the national security of other states but their social structure as well. Since the Bolshevik Revolution, Soviet Russia has been, like the emblem of the Russian eagle, a two-headed state—one an ideological head and the other a national head. Although the size and importance of the ideological head is rapidly diminishing, there still remains an air of menace. Soviet Russia is feared because she is a powerful sovereign state, and because her mere existence threatens the social structure of other states.

Russian leaders fear that immediately after the war, Russia, with her devastated lands and urgent need for a breathing spell, and in spite of her gigantic armies, might be in danger of being throttled by a new Anglo-American-European coalition. She could hardly resist an iron blockade on the seas combined with relentless bombings from the scores of thousands of planes at the disposition of possible enemies. A defeated and subservient Germany would be anxious to regain the favor of victorious Anglo-American powers by joining an anti-Russian coalition. The same would be true of Japan in the west. It would be a splendid opportunity for neo-feudalist elements throughout the world to destroy the very source and breeding place of socialism. At the same time, another partial partition of Russian peripheral lands in the west and in the Caucasus might be effected, to the satisfaction of others concerned. All this could be disguised by magnifying Russia's "threat to the world" through whooped-up propaganda calling the world to unite against the Russian monster.

n

C

C

a

F

p

0

le

01

Will a victorious and irresistible Russia roll on to establish a communist German state as the first step in the Bolshevization of Europe? I will answer, without reservation, no. The specter of a communist Germany or Europe in the wake of the Second World War

is one of the great delusions of some of our leading statesmen and

public figures.

n

l,

y

r.

1-

1-

1-

ar

Sporadic communist outbreaks might take place in Germany and elsewhere in Europe. But the rise of communist states, as after the First World War, will not take place. There are weighty reasons for this. The weightiest of them is Stalin himself. Stalin's dominant fear is a coalition of the world under Anglo-American leadership. Stalin is a realist. He must clearly realize that a communist Germany would be the most effective way to bring about the very coalition he fears. That would be the one issue around which most of the world could unite against Soviet Russia.

It follows, then, that however much the Soviet leaders may wish for a communist Germany, they will be compelled by the realities of power politics to work against their own ideal. Having destroyed Nazism, they will seek, therefore, to establish not a communist Germany, but a democratic one, with full safeguards of property and capitalistic structure. Such is the irony of history. Exactly the same line will be followed by Soviet Russia in her relations with all other states, including Poland—except perhaps the smaller states, such as

Bulgaria, within her immediate zone of influence.

The Nazis, it is true, have said that they would rather throw Germany into the arms of Communist Russia than surrender to England. But this threat is a bluff, pure and simple. The Nazis would be the very first to be liquidated by either the German or the Russian Communists, if in the meantime they were not torn to pieces by their own enraged people. Under less ruthless, capitalistic Anglo-American control, many of them would count on saving their lives and wealth.

This self-imposed line of democratic policy by the Soviet government in the affairs of Europe does not mean that they will walk on a tiptoe lest they awaken the dreaded beast of coalition. Quite the contrary. The same logic of power politics that will force them to continue the defense of the democracies in the postwar world will also force them to a vigorous policy of building, everywhere in Europe, a counterweight to the crushing weight of Anglo-American power. That is why one may expect that Soviet Russia will insist on a strong Germany and on the restoration of sovereign rights to at least those states which she has reason to believe will not be too favorable to the Anglo-Americans.

The coalition of capitalistic countries is the ever-recurring nightmare that has brought so many sleepless nights to the Muscovite rulers since 1918 and will not end until past 1955. This is also the key to Russian power politics of the next decade. It ties up such wide-ranging events as the Anglo-Russian treaty of alliance signed in 1942, the historic dissolution of the Comintern in 1943, and Russian determination to help establish a postwar democratic (not com-

tri

co

no

th

ro

of

in

an

munist) Germany.

The leaders of Soviet Russia believe that if she can survive the next tumultous decade she will then be free from the incubus of hostile coalitions that has haunted her ever since 1918. In the years immediately following the war, Russian power politics will therefore have four goals:

First, to prevent isolation of Russia and possible crystallization of

a hostile world under Anglo-American leadership.

Second, to prevent domination of Europe and especially of Ger-

many by Britain and the United States.

Third, to secure in the coming world settlement better strategic foundations of the Russian state.

Fourth, to help establish, if possible, a system of true collective security as a further protection.

The last is the most important and fundamental goal of Russian

foreign policy, as it is of United States foreign policy.

A system of collective security, however, in order to be truly effective and politically acceptable to Russia, or the United States, or any other state, must solve three basic problems involved in international organization. They are:

1. The Problem of Representation: How to give fair representation in the World Council to large and small sovereign states; and yet avoid the domination of the smaller states or the sacrifice of the

legitimate historical interests of the larger states.

2. The Problem of Sovereignty and Government: How to delegate the needed powers to the World Council for effective action based on majority vote; and yet preserve the full sovereignty of each state.

3. The Problem of an International Police Force: How to establish an effective armed force under direct control of the World Council to prevent or stop wars of aggression; and yet avoid creating a Frankenstein out of such an armed force, which might threaten the security of individual leading powers.

The solution of these three problems is essential for an effective and acceptable international organization, and failure to solve any one of the three renders a workable system for collective defense impossible. The current proposal for a revived League of Nations fails to solve all three problems. How they can be solved, I have tried to show in my book, Total Peace, to which I refer the reader.

With these problems solved, Russia will obtain a guarantee of collective security against aggression from Europe or Asia. She will no longer have to fear an Anglo-American coalition against her; and the Anglo-Americans will no longer have to fear a conquest of Europe or Asia by Russia's increasing military might. Once the nations of the world have achieved freedom from war, they can start, each in its own way, and all together, building a new world of economic and political justice.

The Genius of the Russian Language

By Boris B. Bogoslovsky

As EVERY face has its own countenance and expression, every language has its peculiar personality and character. Centuries ago the versatile Charles the Fifth of Spain, who finally abdicated his vast empire to work in a garden and play with clocks, put it very neatly. He said: "I would speak to my Lord in Latin, to my

beloved in French, and to my horse in German."

Quite recently our own Clarence Day in his humorous vein contributed a few penetrating observations concerning peculiarities of French, particularly when it touches upon ecclesiastic matters. He was greatly disturbed by the somewhat finicky gentility of French that deprives the biblical atmosphere of its stern simplicity and majestic power. In the French narrative, instead of "Behold now behemoth," we read Voici l'hippopotame! Serene "green pastures" become urbane parcs herbeaux and "thy rod and thy staff," ton baton. The awe-inspiring monster of leviathan shrinks into just le crocodile, and David the conqueror of the Philistine, "a youth, ruddy and of fair countenance," effeminates into un enfant, blond et d'une belle figure.

0

1

tı

st

p

th

th

Even more disturbing are prayers. To many a foreigner, prayers in a polished French sound decidedly too worldly and too politely conversational, almost on the verge of impertinence. Take, for instance, outbursts like Je vous adore, o mon Sauveur! Or, a measured statement like: Mon Dieu, je vous remercie trés humblement

de toutes les graces que vous m'avez faites jusqu'ici.

Outside of this idiosyncrasy, the noble French, of course, has remarkable achievements to its credit. Hardly any other language can surpass it in elegance and cultivated grace. Its amazing precision and lucidity of presentation in poetry, scientific discourse, or philosophical argument are universally recognized as a special distinction of Gallic culture.

All other languages similarly have their particular strong points as well as limitations. Latin, for example, is the most influential single language of our western civilization. It excels in brevity, force-

fulness, and definiteness which makes it the ideal medium for formal statements and impressive declarations. The pronouncements like the familiar: Veni, vidi, vinci, Exegi monumentum aere perennius, and Caveant consules, cannot be translated into any other language without losing their magnificent metallic tenacity and vigor.

Latin's most direct modern descendant, Italian, presents quite a different picture. Its *forte* is an overflowing fiery passion and dramatic tension that can easily flare up into melodramatic histrionics and theatrical grandiloquence. Even if you do not know the language, go to some spirited Italian meeting, or dial on your radio a popular Italian program, and you can't help being swayed into the emotional tide of the occasion by sheer power of vocal dynamics of the animated language.

German is a complete antithesis of Italian. It is deliberate, thorough, earnest, and methodical. Its weighty structure, elaborate categories, fine distinctions of meaning, long words, and endless paragraphs make it exacting and not particularly accommodating.

What student of German escaped that disheartening experience of painfully breaking through a "strongly fortified" sentence half a page long only to find in the last line the stubborn *nicht* that reverses the meaning of everything that was said before!

German probably is the only language where the excessive length of a paragraph is not only tolerated, but even encouraged by law. There is, or at least was, in Germany a legal requirement that in an application for a patent the invention to be patented should be described in a single sentence. In spite of its heaviness and over-complicated structure, German is an excellent language for abstract speculations, rigorous analysis, detailed description, and expression of mild emotions of a lyrical and quiet nature.

The earmarks of English are its simplicity, reserve, and pragmatic realism. The inherent distaste for long words and complex structures makes it a perfect "brass tacks" language. Read one of those instruction sheets that accompany some household contraption, or a patent medicine, where the information is given in half a dozen different languages. It is invariably the English version that is shortest, clearest, and easiest to follow. Or take road signs: "Go," "Stop," "Right," "Left," "Hill," "School," "Keep Off," and so on. All of them couldn't be shorter and more to the point. Words of any extensive length are guillotined with great eagerness and ease: "Said a co-ed at Mass Tech 'Wait a sec, the prof went to gym. Let us go to the lab and do some math'." Socially the trend is distinctly imbued

with camaradery, informality, and good cheer.

The functional simplicity of English is even greater than structural. Grammar is completely "stripped for action" and reduced to the very minimum possible. The vocal pattern is also streamlined thoroughly and cleared of all unnecessary frills and trimmings. The customary range of pitch is narrow and all words are well welded into the bulk of the sentence, no single syllable being allowed to stick out sharpened by an undue accent. The tempo of speech is moderate and its rhythm uniform and plain.

All this makes English an ideal vehicle for expressing common sense of common man bent on common action for common good.

Now, if we approach Russian from this analytic point of view,

what would be its special excellence, its special distinction?

The outstanding feature of Russian is its extraordinary expressiveness and richness in shades of meaning, in nuance of moods, and

in varieties of intentions it can register and convey.

These characteristics have not grown whimsically by mere chance. A character of a language, like a character of a man, is the result of all its past. The typical features of the Russian language are closely interwoven with the whole pattern of Russian cultural history. Through centuries there has been in Russian psychology a greater

emphasis on lyrical contemplation than on overt action.

In that respect, the Russian temper is quite different from the American. The great Russian artist, Shalyapin, liked to illustrate the contrast by comparing two drivers, Russian and American. When an American driver finds his windshield dirty, he would stop his car, wipe the glass, and then resume driving. If the same thing happens to a Russian he would not bother to clean the windshield. He would just stick his head out of the side window and continue driving, watching the road in that way. The story, as all stories of that kind, is an exaggeration and somewhat out of date, but nevertheless the contrast is essentially true.

The reluctance to act is closely connected with a predilection for thinking in broad and general terms. The Russian mind is impregnated with love for philosophical speculation. The philosophizing about eternal problems of life has been both the greatest Russian virtue and almost sinful over-indulgence. Among intellectuals no novel, or even a short story, could receive recognition unless it touched upon deep "isms" or discussed some "question," preferably one of the "accursed questions" which was the standard term for profound, recurrent, and evasive problems of ethics and social justice.

Until recently, the predominance of contemplation over action conspicuously runs through the whole Russian history. All through the nineteenth century, when literature, music, and theatre were growing by leaps and bounds, there were hardly any great states-

men or political leaders of importance.

Most of the national creative energy went into building intelligentsia. The very fact that the word intelligentsia, together with samovar, balalaika, and soviet, was admitted into other languages without translation shows that it refers to something that has no exact equivalent in other cultures. For the same reason English "gentleman," German Weltanschauung, and French élan became cosmopolitan words, each signifying the special contribution of its native country to world culture.

Intelligentsia has been a specifically Russian phenomenon. Many historical factors cooperated to turn the pre-revolutionary Russia into a greenhouse made to order for cultivation of intelligentsia.

The material foundation for the growth of intelligentsia was laid by the economic security enjoyed by its members, who were recruited mainly from the middle class. Every agricultural civilization offers considerable stability to its middle class. In addition, college education, which was a necessary prerequisite for being a full-fledged intelligent (Russian for an intellectual), practically guaranteed a comfortable and leisurely life, even if it did not provide the "high standards of living" so much valued in industrial communities. In fact, the very lack of opportunities for making large fortunes suppressed all ambitions in that direction, and turned more mental energy into contemplative and speculative channels.

Psychologically, the favorable social atmosphere was established by an extraordinary tolerance towards extreme political and philosophical views, particularly in young people. A college student could declare himself a socialist, anarchist, revolutionary, unbeliever, or a pacifist without impairing his social standing. To the contrary, taking a definite stand on important issues, he would command respect even among his opponents, who would be eager to discuss and argue the

crucial points of the controversy.

Consequently, in private gatherings the freedom of discussion was unlimited. The same unlimited freedom of speech was exercised within the walls of universities, even in large mass meetings. No wonder that in this set-up the Russian flair for philosophizing crystallized into the tradition and institution of intelligentsia.

The flourishing of intelligentsia in turn led to a cult and culti-

vation of discussion and conversation. In behavioristic terms, an intellectual may be described as a person who can discuss general problems with facility and competence. Although a Russian *intelligent* in addition must possess considerable social-mindedness, personal integrity, and tolerance, essentially he has been also a verbal creature.

The thirst for verbalization was particularly unquenchable because it met with very little competition from other sources of entertainment. Until lately, very few students and young people generally took part in any organized sports whatsoever. Among intellectuals besides playing cards and chess, most leisure time, outside of conversation, was given to reading, theatre, and public lectures. All three enterprises were very serious, saturated with social poblems, and particularly useful as a starting point for conversation. Like a spontaneous combustion, an animated conversation would start inevitably as soon as several intellectuals happened to gather and would go on for hours, getting particularly lively after midnight.

In addition all over Russia were thousands of organized discussion groups. Every high school, in Russian gimnazia, would have at least one, usually more, kruzhok, a little circle, a group of a half a dozen or a dozen students who would meet regularly to discuss an important book or some social issue. Similar kruzhoks were com-

mon practically in all communities of intellectuals.

Paradoxically enough, under Russian conditions even an urge for overt, direct, and even violent action led to more discussion and oratory. Beginning with the slogan of "going into people" in the seventies of the last century, most of the efforts to improve social and political conditions took the form of a mass revolutionary movement. For decades and decades up to 1917, every day the work of the revolutionaries was the same monotonous routine: organization of illegal meetings to be used for propaganda of revolutionary ideas, and agitation for subversive activities by means of spoken and printed word. Finally, the events of 1917 proved that at least under certain conditions the tongue is mightier than the sword.

The victory of the Revolution, however, did not diminish the oratorical zeal. To the contrary, the so-called Kerensky régime was perhaps the most prolific speech making era in the whole history of Russia, if not of the world. Endless meetings, small and large, were almost continuously held everywhere in representative institutions, public offices, factories, schools, barracks, street corners, and private

b

apartments.

Of course, the predominance of contemplation does not mean that

the capacity for action and controlling environment has been totally absent in the Russian make-up. No country can exist on contemplation alone, and Russia has not only survived through centuries, but has grown into a mighty empire. Even among intellectuals themselves, from time to time there appeared strong protests against the spineless contemplative idealism. Nihilist Basarov in Turgenev's Fathers and Sons, had exactly that protest on his mind when he sarcastically implored his friend, Arkady: "Please do not orate so elegantly." The other admonition by Chekov's professor: "Gentlemen, this is the time to do things"—the standard joke among intellectuals — was funny because the esteemed professor again only talked about "doing things," but the need for "doing things" was genuine indeed.

The latest and the most powerful wave of the same trend was the advent of communism. In its essence, the Bolshevik Revolution implied a change from the psychology of idealistic, ethical contemplation to the pattern of realistic "doing," often ruthless and unscrupulous. In that transformation lies its greatest significance in Russian history, and the passionate opposition to communism, especially among intellectuals, in many cases is not so much a protest against its political and economic ideals as an expression of repug-

nance against an entirely different psychology.

However, even Bolshevism, with all its emphasis on work and action, depends greatly on the spoken and printed word. With its immense propaganda machinery, perpetual meetings, trials, confessions, "self-criticism," discussions of the party line, its ever active political literature and politically-minded fiction, the Soviet government has been one of the most loquacious forms of social organization, at least up to the recent German invasion.

So, all in all, the tongue that proved to be even mightier than the sword has become the chief medium of national self-expression, and

expressiveness has become its chief characteristic.

s,

at

Russians have been keenly aware of the part played by language in their life and culture. Most of the intellectuals know that they belong to the tribe of great talkers and aspire to be good conversationalists. In a cynical way Senator Kony, a brilliant jurist and wit, summed it up by saying that the Russian national disease always has been diuresis, or incontinence of speech, which, in Russian, is a much more clever phrase than any translation can convey.

As a complete contrast to this sarcastic witticism, perhaps the most exalted adoration of a native tongue ever written, even with some

mystical touch to it, can be found in the famous poem in prose by Turgenev, "The Russian Language," which sounds almost like a religious incantation: "In days of doubt, in days of painful meditation concerning the destinies of my fatherland, thou alone art my prop and my support, O great, mighty, just and free Russian language. Were it not for thee, how could one fail to fall into despair at the sight of all that goes on at home? But it is impossible to believe that such a language was not bestowed upon a great people!"

II.

If the ability to express all varieties of human experience is the genius of the Russian language, how is the expressiveness achieved and what are the characteristics that make Russian so expressive?

Verbal expressiveness is achieved when, for each experience — a thought, mood, or desire — we find a proper and exact equivalent in speech. Since variety of experience is practically infinite, to be expressive a language must offer the greatest possible variety of forms to choose from.

As in the evolution of animal and plant life, the progress depends on the richness and diversity of organisms available, in the same way, the eloquence of a language depends on the multiformity of its structure and flexibility of its usage. Russian possesses both require-

ments in a great measure.

Perhaps the greatest source of richness and flexibility of Russian lies in the ease with which new words are built out of already existing terms. This can be done in different ways. Many new expressions may, for instance, branch out from the same idea, utilizing and emphasizing its different aspects. Thus, from the word dukh (spirit, breath) at least twenty-one variations of this root have evolved, ranging from the verb "strangle" to the noun "ventilator."

New words may be formed also by expressing the same idea in terms of another part of speech. For instance, practically every Russian noun has at least one, and often several, corresponding adjectives. The word dérevo which means a tree and wood, has five of them: drevésnyi—pertaining to trees, dereviánnyi—made of wood, derévchatyi — covered with trees, drevoobráznyi — tree-like, and drevovidnyi—looking like a tree.

More effective and far-reaching is the technique of adding modifying syllables at the beginning or at the end of the original word. The fundamental meaning of the word is left almost unchanged, but it acquires a different mood and a new emotional atmosphere. Just because it deals only with fine nuances and delicate shades of differentiation, the method contributes greatly to the expressiveness of Russian.

Let us take the word syn, Russian for a son (which, by the way, shows that Russian is indeed a member of the Indo-European family of languages). In Russian it is a rather reserved, cold, and formal word, but is followed by several more emotional variations, synók—nice little son, synóchek—dear little son, syníshka—little nice and cute son, and syníshche—big, heavy, and impressive son.

Even such an impersonal and insignificant thing as a pond, in Russian prud, as well as practically every other noun, has its quota of endearing and descriptive versions, prudik — a small pond, prudók—a small and unpretentious pond, prudóchek—a small and pleasant pond, prudíshko—a small and rather miserable pond, and

prudishche—a big pond.

Adjectives can be modified in the same way. Bélyi—white, forms: bélenkii—white and nice, and belovátyi—whitish, belovátenkii—

whitish and nice, and belésyi—unpleasantly whitish.

The process reaches its real climax in verbs. As an illustration, let us take the Russian equivalent of "to whistle." In English the verb expresses a definite and clear cut idea that seemingly needs no modification. Not so in Russian. To start with, there are four corresponding verbs: svistét, svistát, svistnut and svistyvat. Svistiét has practically the same meaning as "to whistle." Svistát means to whistle habitually, or at least continuously for a while, and with some zest. Svistnut signifies uttering a short and, as it were, self-sufficient whistle. It is interesting that the forms expressing the specific shades of meaning often provoke their own use in a figurative sense as slang. For instance, the form just mentioned, svistnut, has two wellaccepted additional meanings: to hit someone in a swift and unexpected manner, and to steal something in a sly way—to swipe. The last form, svistyvat, which is used mostly with modifiers, conveys the idea of whistling repeatedly through a certain length of time. When referred to the past, it is very close in its meaning to the English construction "I used to whistle."

Each of these forms may take a further differentiation of meaning by the addition of short modifying particles at the beginning of the word. For instance, zasvistát would mean to start whistling; otsvistát, to finish whistling; posvistyvat, to whistle in a casual and leisurely manner; nasvistyvat, to try whistling some definite tune;

fi

SP

N

u

d

pa

m

fr

K

SC

h

h

N

g

th

b

20

is

P

h

0

N

fi

tl

n

fi

r

h

y

tl

prisvistyvat, to whistle in addition to doing something else, as when accentuating some rhythmical work by whistling; prosvistét, to have a tune whistled from its beginning to its end, or to spend some definite time whistling (in its slang meaning it is very close to "to squander"); peresvistét, to whistle too long or longer than others; vysvistyvat, to whistle a tune in an elaborate and careful way; osvistát, to whistle with an intent to show a disapproval or contempt; sosvistát, to have something whistled in an accomplished and polished manner, almost in a formal way; nedosvistát, to fail to finish

whistling properly.

Additional nuances of meaning can be indicated by adding at the end of a verb the syllable sia, which in its original intent is equivalent to the English "oneself" in expressions like "to wash oneself." Very often, however, the idea of directing the action upon oneself is completely lost, and the ending is used to produce new meanings. Thus, rassvistátsia means to go on whistling until you warm up and whistle with ease and gusto; peresvistyvatsia, for several people (or even several birds) to whistle in turn as if answering one another; nasvistátsia, to whistle until you get tired of and fed up with whistling (in slang, to get gloriously drunk); dosvistátsia, to whistle long and recklessly until something unpleasant happens; vysvistátsia, to reach the end of the rope in whistling, to have nothing more to whistle. The last two forms are used mostly in a figurative sense.

These twenty forms—and the list is by no means complete—are not a special privilege of the verb svistét. Nor do they imply that Russians are particularly fond of whistling. Every verb describing

any activity is entitled to the same wealth of development.

It may be interesting to see how the same prodigal variability manifests itself in Russian names. Often foreign readers of Russian novels are greatly confused by the fact that the same person appears under many different names. The confusion is natural because ad-

dressing a person in Russian is indeed an intricate affair.

To start with, every Russian has three names—no more, no less—all actually used. The first, or Christian name, like Olga, Tatyana, or Boris, cannot be invented or improvised upon. It only can be chosen from a list of traditional names which originally were names of Christian saints. The day which, according to the calendar, is dedicated to a person's patron saint is his name-day, and is celebrated in Russia more than the birthday, even in families that attribute no religious significance to the name or the date. No other name, particularly nobody's last name, can be given to a child as his

first name.

The second name does not allow any choice at all. It is always a special modification of the father's first name. For instance, if the name of Boris' father is Nicholas, in Russian Nikolai, the second name of Boris would be Nikoláevich, which roughly means a son of Nikolái. If it is a girl whose father is Nikolái, her second name would be Nikoláevna, or Nikolái's daughter.

The third name is the family name and is inherited from parents,

unless it is a pen name or party name.

The use of the three names is complicated. Let us take a middle-class boy whose full name is Nikolái Ivánovich Popóv. In all official papers and documents he will be referred to as Nikolái Popóv, or more definitely, Nikolái Ivánovich Popóv. At home and by his close friends he would be called by many endearing names like Kólia, Kóliushka, Kólechka, Kólen'ka, Nikólushka or Nikélen'ka, each person choosing his favorite diminutive. By his playmates occasionally he may be called also Kól'ka, but if somebody else called him Kól'ka, he would be insulted. If his father or mother addressed him as Nikolái that means that something is fundamentally wrong and he is going to be badly reprimanded. In school, by his teachers and fellow students, he will be called by his last name only, Popóv, and that is probably the only place, outside of the army, where he would be called in this way.

When the boy becomes a young man he would be called, by his acquaintances and not very close friends, Nikolái Ivánovich, but he is always introduced to new acquaintances as Nikolái Ivánovich Popóv. His relatives and close friends would still continue calling him by diminutive names like Kólia or Kólechka. In all government offices and on any official business generally he will be addressed as Mr. Popov, or Citizen Popov, but if any of his acquaintances or friends called him in this way, it would mean that this person breaks

their friendly relation and even is disgusted with him.

If the boy were born in the country and lived among peasants, not in the middle-class, he would be much more often called by his first name, Nikolái, or just by the last name, Popóv, and after he reaches middle-age he would probably be addressed quite often by his second name only, Ivánovich, colloquially abbreviated to Ivánvch.

The whole business of multiple addressing is made even more complicated by the fact that with the exception of the situation when the names Kólka, Mr. Popóv, and Iványch are used, in all other

cases, our Nikolái Ivánovich Popóv may be addressed either in the second person singular indicating more intimate relationship, or in the second person plural which is more formal.

me

tio

the

of

all

ly

ph

be

th

ab

dis

sh

ra

sia

br

a t

ily

th

m

CO

sta

ci.

to

ha

ar

th

th

to

Another important source of flexibility and expressiveness of Russian lies in the almost complete absence of any definite order of words in a sentence. In English, the whole meaning of a statement is often determined by the position of words. "Paul killed Peter"—and Peter's predicament depends entirely on the fact that he is at the tail end of the sentence. Change it into "Peter killed Paul" and it is Paul who suffers now.

In Russian, the question whether Peter or Paul is the killer is answered by the endings of the names. Pável ubil Petrá, dooms Peter, and Pávla ubil Petr makes Paul the victim, irrespective of his position in the sentence.

Therefore, in Russian, the order of words is entirely undetermined and a change in their position does not change the basic meaning, or the "fundamental tone" of the statement. However, the variations in the position of the words are responsible for different emotional overtones of the sentence and for its mental atmosphere.

For instance, the statement "Last night I went to New York in my old overcoat" may have, in Russian, exactly the same structure, or it may have the following patterns: "Night yesterday went to New York I in overcoat old my," or "I yesterday night in my overcoat old to New York went," or many other similar combinations. The choice of the order of words depends entirely on the desired rhythm of the phrase, the emotional mood of the speaker, and the particular shades of meaning he wants to emphasize. It is easy to visualize what abundance of variations can be achieved by a gifted and imaginative writer or speaker!

III.

In addition to the technical aspects of Russian responsible for its expressiveness, there is one general and basic factor out of which, like from a mighty and deep-seated root, have grown all other characteristics of the language. This root is the blend of spiritual multiformity, psychological universality, and intuitive sensitivity that permeate the whole structure of Russian culture and tradition. The sympathetic responsiveness of the Russian mind has been fostered and stimulated by the peculiarities of Russian history, particularly by the fact that probably no other culture in the course of its develop-

ment absorbed and assimilated as many different foreign influences as Russia did.

Russians have been aware of that as well as of the Eurasian position of Russia. No wonder that when they started to ponder about the destiny of their country, many of them came to the conclusion that the ultimate mission of Russia, its special part in the great drama of history, is integration and reconciliation of cultural patterns of all other nations, and unification of mankind in the spirit of brother-

ly love.

f

t

t

1

t

y

Perhaps nobody else expressed this belief so eloquently and emphatically as Dostoevsky in his famous Pushkin address. Said he: "Not in a spirit of enmity (as one might have thought it would have been) but in friendliness and perfect love, we received into our soul the geniuses of foreign nations, all alike without preference of race, able by instinct from almost the very first step to discern, to discount distinctions, to excuse and reconcile them, and therein we already showed our readiness and inclination, which had only just become manifest to ourselves, for a common and universal union with all the races of the great Aryan family. Yes, beyond all doubt the destiny of a Russian is pan-European and universal. To become a true Russian, to become a Russian fully . . . means only to become the brother of all men, to become, if you will, a universal man. . . To a true Russian, Europe and the destiny of all the mighty Aryan family is as dear as Russia herself, as the destiny of his own native country, because our destiny is universality, won not by the sword, but by the strength of brotherhood and our fraternal aspirations to reunite mankind. . . And in course of time I believe that we-not we, of course, but our children to come-will all without exception understand that to be a true Russian does indeed mean to aspire to reconcile finally the contradictions of Europe, to find a way out for the yearning for Europe in our Russian soul, pan-human and all-uniting, to include within our soul by brotherly love all our brethren, and at last, it may be, to pronounce the final word of the great general harmony, of the final brotherly communion of all nations in accordance with the law of the gospel of Christ! I know, I know too well, that my words may appear ecstatic, exaggerated, and fantastic. Let them be so, I do not repent having uttered them."

To what extent, if any, and in what form the prophecy of Dos-

toevsky will be realized, only time can tell.

A Russian Commune in Kansas

By Mark Aldanov

Seventy years ago, in the State of Kansas, near the town of Wichita, there was established a very peculiar Russian commune. The founders carried out an experiment, interesting from a social and especially from a psychological point of view, which ended in complete failure. All the three leaders of this commune were people of very high moral qualities. They differed greatly from each other, however, in origin, in their philosophical and political views. One was an aristocrat, another—a peasant, the third—just an "intellectual" (in Russia this was almost a social class in itself). The first was a positivist, the second a mystic, the third—a man of indefinite religious views, not fully a believer, but ready to admit that "there are more things on heaven and earth. . ." The latter, Nicholas Chaikovsky, I knew well in the final period of his life, so that this article is based not only on archival and published material, but also on stories told me by himself.

0

q

tl

g

n

B

ai

a

0.

tı

u

a

a

The first of this trio was Nikolai Konstantinovich Geins. He was born in 1839. His family belonged to that class of the gentry which for an entire century gave to Russia its statesmen, its generals, its governors. Geins studied in a military school and then graduated from the Academy of the General Staff. From childhood he showed great ability for mathematics and was even nicknamed "the little Archimedes." 1 It must be allowed, however, that in a small provincial town of that time it was not necessary to be a great mathematician to earn such a nickname. Geins graduated from the Academy with high honors and was on the road to a brilliant military career. At twenty-five he was a captain on the General Staff and represented Russia at some kind of an international commission on the measurement of the meridian arc. Undoubtedly, in another ten years he would have become a general in command of some division or the governor of some province (his brother actually was governor of the province of Kazan), if his views had not undergone a drastic change

¹N. V. Reingardt, Neobyknovennaya lichnost. Kazan, 1889. p. 3.

—he came to hate war and all military activity. Moreover, Geins came into contact with the revolutionary movement.

This important fact connects him with the other two personages described in this article—Malikov and Chaikovsky. All three in their youth had relations with revolutionaries and all three later turned away from them.

Participants in the revolutionary movement of the eighteen seventies in Russia were people of the most varied convictions. Some wanted political freedom, some a socialist revolution, some the abolition of the state; others wanted to help the poor, without any politics, others again hardly knew themselves what they wanted. The revolutionaries of the seventies also varied a great deal in their moral qualities. Reactionaries, then and later, depicted them as villains and monsters, while the majority of the Russian intelligentsia considered them to be heroes and saints. The author of these lines, as a novelist, gave much time and effort to studying them as people. He knew many of them personally, among them such well-known figures as Herman Lopatin, the most remarkable of them all, Vera Figner, Breshkovskaya, Vera Zasulich, S. Ivanov, N. Chaikovsky, D. Aitov, and others. I believe that there were almost no "villains" among them, perhaps with the exception of one or two, and certainly not any among those enumerated above. There were also very few "saints," though undoubtedly there were some. As a group, the revolutionaries of that time were distributed between these two extremes, and just as in a spectrum there are many colors between the ultra-violet and the infra-red rays, so there were many moral hues and shades among all these people of tragic fate who have passed into history.

Apparently Geins had bad luck—he came into contact with revolutionaries of the lower type who, for the sake of attaining their aims, were not too particular in their choice of means. Later Geins spoke of the revolutionaries, to say the least, coldly. He asserted that they differed little from the reactionary servants of the old régime against whom they fought, that their own power and their own right of coercion were of more importance to them than the freedom of others.

Having broken with the revolutionaries, and having come to hate

²However, somewhere in Geins' papers I came across a more or less sympathetic reference to the revolutionaries.

⁸N. V. Chaikovsky. Paris, 1929. Vol. I, p. 101.

SO

he

tir

W

dr

W

hi

lie

ca F

na

Ve

er

of

pe

ab

at

T

aı

Y

te

F

I

01

K

the military profession, Geins fell into complete despair. He spoke of suicide. People often make a parade of hopelessness—this is the base of a good half of the nineteenth century poetry. The phrase: "he was thinking of suicide," has become a cliché which involuntarily calls forth the sceptical question: "if he thought of it—what prevented him?" But Geins was the most truthful of men and his words can be fully relied upon. He did not commit suicide, but came to a sudden decision—to leave Russia for a long time, perhaps forever.

Had he any other, personal, private motives for such a step? I asked Chaikovsky about it, but he did not know or did not wish to say. I think, however, that there must have been some such reason. Geins did not believe in revolution and had no intention of doing that work abroad for which political emigrés usually leave their own country. Therefore, it was scarcely necessary for him to go abroad. To tell the truth, in the Russia of Alexander II's time he could do

almost everything he was planning to do abroad.

Why he chose America, and not Switzerland, Paris, or London can be understood. "The New Continent" seemed in every sense to be a new world. It was supposed that everything there would be completely different. If one was to begin a new life, then it was best to begin it in the United States, where there were no century-old survivals of the past and where "all people were equal." In America, Geins changed his name and called himself "William Frey." For this change to an American name there also seemed to be no need; he did not pose as an American, was not in hiding, and, of course, had no intention of making any kind of a career for himself in the United States. Probably the change of name was to underline a complete spiritual rebirth—the former man was finished, the new one had come to life. His money soon gave out. He already had a family. Chaikovsky told me that in America Frey was in dire need. An American business firm, working on military orders for the Russian government, offered him a well-paid job. He answered that he had abandoned a military career in Russia because he hated war and everything connected with it and could not possibly work for a company which traded on war. Probably the management of the company considered him a dangerous lunatic.

Once, on a journey, he had to leave the train at St. Louis because he had no ticket to go any further, and no money to buy one. To avoid starvation he became a cab-driver. His horse soon died. This could have been foreseen. The Russian Military Academy could hardly have been good preparation for cab-driving in Missouri. Frey's situation became still more distressing. Nevertheless, he spoke later of the six months spent in St. Louis as "the happiest time of my life"—here he became thoroughly familiar with the

works of Auguste Comte.

The former captain of the General Staff, the unsuccessful cabdriver of St. Louis became a confirmed positivist for life. It is a well-known fact that Auguste Comte had followers who believed in his infallibility more firmly than even the most devout Catholic believes in the infallibility of the Pope. One such (Vyrubov) was called by the famous anarchist Bakunin "Comtist priest." William Frey remained a positivist to the end of his life. One can judge the naive character of his faith by his attempt to convert Leo Tolstoy. "I am certain," wrote Frey, "that he (Tolstoy) has outgrown the theological level of development and that in many respects he is very close to positivism."

Here I shall leave Frey for a while and pass to the other found-

ers of the Kansas Commune.

Alexander Kapitonovich Malikov was seemingly the most gifted of all the participants in the Commune. He was the son of simple peasants and in many ways, especially in his habits, always remained a peasant, although he was a university graduate. I heard much about him from Chaikovsky and from Aitov who, at a certain period, had been his adherents. All spoke of his exceptional charm, his absorbing eloquence, his mastery of the art of telling a story, and of his moral integrity. There are witnesses to the same in literature. The revolutionary Charushin calls him "a highly likable, intelligent and well educated man." Others who knew him well, such as

*Letters of Frey to L. N. Tolstoy, Geneva, Elpidin Publication, 1886. p. 6. The Slavonic Section of the New York Public Library has a lithographic copy of the "Correspondence of Frey and Tolstoy," which belonged to the well-known George Kennan. In the same Library (Manuscript Section, room 319) are preserved papers of William Frey. They were donated to the Library by a close friend of his, Dr. Yahud, and I believe have never yet been used. The collection consists of 366 letters, 26 manuscripts and some dozen photographs. The manuscripts are most diverse—fragments of diaries, articles and reports, an introduction to a course in arithmetic, Frey's will, etc. Geins often wrote in pencil and many of his notes are badly blurred. In his notebook one finds in complete disorder addresses of his friends, thoughts on Tolstoy, philosophical considerations, the price of railway tickets, some kind of a "theory of lamps"—he had theories for everything.

⁵N. A. Charushin, Kruzhok Chaikovtsev. Moscow, 1926. p. 119 and V. G. Korolenko, Istoriya moego sovremennika. Berlin, 1923. v. IV.

M

ser

cas

wa

101

fro

re

yo his

be

fro

ole

me

by

ole

bir

to

no

pe

SOI

en

WO

en

of

Cł

m

Vi

di

ma

cre

We

do

ga

th

2 5

th

jo

Faresov, Korolenko, Kovalik, all likewise give flattering reports.

Malikov founded something strange—neither a religion nor a sect—a small group of people who called themselves "Godmen." He defined his creed as follows: "We are all peacemakers. . . The beggar, the capitalist, the judge and the accused, are all Godmen. One who loves mankind will not find it difficult to bear with an offense and to forgive its perpetrator. . . Forget in your language the words 'enemy,' 'adversary,' 'war,' 'baseness,' and enemies will vanish from the earth. . ." The reader will no doubt ask in amazement what is essentially new in this teaching and why a new word and such a strange and pretentious name was necessary for its designation. I think the reader will be right. Malikov, it is said, was the precursor of Tolstoy-the-moralist. Of course, in Tolstoy's teachings also there was not much that was new, as Tolstoy himself often underlined. But Tolstoy-the-moralist did captivate people. Malikov also captivated some few.

Strange as it may seem, Malikov in his youth held the position of examining magistrate—a position that ill fitted him. However, at that time, apparently his ideas were not yet clearly defined. It is still more strange that he had the patronage of the leader of the Russian reactionaries, Pobedonostsev, who had been his professor at the university. Of course Pobedonostsev had not and could not have any sympathy with Malikov's political and philosophical-religious views. Apparently he simply liked him for his talents. Like some other pillars of reaction, Pobedonostsev allowed himself the

privilege of having a "protegé" in the opposite camp.

Malikov's contact with revolutionary affairs, however, was so insignificant that it is hardly worth mentioning. He was deported to northern Russia, then given permission to return and to settle in Orel. Here he began a persistent verbal war with the revolutionaries in an attempt to convince them that revolution could not save the world. "In every man there is a divine element," he said. "It is sufficient to appeal to it, to find the God in man, for no coercion to be necessary. God will settle everything in people's souls and everyone will become just and kind." Apparently, however, the revolutionaries did not believe that there was a divine element in the chiefs of police or did not wish to appeal to it. The success of

⁶A. I. Faresov, "Odin iz semidesyatnikov," Vestnik Evropy, v. 229, 1904 and S. F. Kovalik, Revolutsionnoe dvizhenie semidesyatykh godov. Moscow, 1928, p. 105.

Malikov's preaching among the young disturbed them, and they sent their best debaters to oppose him. "The disputes in most cases came to no conclusion; in the opinion of those present, logic was on the side of the revolutionaries, but the sympathies of the ma-

iority were with Malikov." 7

In contrast to Malikov and Geins, Nikolai Vasilievich Chaikovsky from his early youth became firmly associated with the history of the revolutionary movement. The well-known St. Petersburg circle of young revolutionaries bore his name (Chaikovtsy). But like both his future collaborators in the Kansas Commune, Chaikovsky soon became disappointed in the revolution. He disassociated himself from the revolutionary movement before he was twenty-five years old. He used to say that he was at that time repelled by the cynical methods and actions of the well-known revolutionary Nechaev and by the affair described in Dostoevsky's novel The Possessed. Chronologically, this is not quite clear. It is possible that Chaikovsky combined impressions which he had received at different times. Listening to his stories, the feeling remained with me that he was disappointed not in the people, but in the ideas. He continued as before to like the people and even fifty years later he spoke with great liking of some of the participants in the revolutionary movement of the seventies. The failing of Chaikovsky, both as a man and as a political worker, had always been that he succumbed too readily to the influence of others. In his old age he fell for a time under the influence of Savinkov. In his youth Malikov made a great impression on him. Chaikovsky decided to give up participation in the revolutionary movement. He saw his aim now in finding and developing the divine element in himself and in others. Apparently he and Malikov differed in their understanding of the purely religious side of "Godmanhood." Later, in 1905, Chaikovsky wrote that "the Godmen's creed was in direct opposition to Christianity in its ethical content as well as in its attitude toward positive, experimental knowledge." I do not believe this was true even in reference to himself, but as regards Malikov it was completely wrong. The difference between them lay also in the fact that Malikov took everything in too literal a sense, himself as a "Godman" included. His family understood it the same way; Malikov's little son ran about the house exclaiming joyfully, "Daddy is God."

^{78.} F. Kovalik, op. cit., p. 105.

^{*}Vestnik Evropy, May 1905, pp. 447-8. Chaikovsky's Letter to the Editor.

The "Godmen" had more reason than Geins to leave Russia. The Government and the censorship did not like sects. Besides, Chaikovsky was on the police black-list for his former activities—he might have been arrested any day. In 1875 they decided to emigrate and were joined by several other adherents of Malikov's teachings. The "Godmen" in all numbered about fifteen.

ab

W

an

th

M

son

of

in

mi

to

lea

lif

W

Wi

for

SOI

the

Wa

de

to

he

of

on

rit

CO

av

ha

m

TI

sic

CO

vic

po

be

II.

Carlyle wrote in 1838: "Curious how all Europe is but like a set of parishes of the same county; participant of the self-same influences, ever since the Crusades, and earlier;—and these glorious wars of ours are but like parish brawls, which begin in mutual ignorance, intoxication and boastful speech; which end in broken windows, damage, waste, and bloody noses; and which one hopes the general good sense is now in the way towards putting down, in some measure!"

These words cannot be read now without a wry smile. During the nineteenth century, however, they were true. And they applied not only to Europe but to the United States as well. America had great political freedom; in Russia, under Tsar Alexander II, there was much less. Nevertheless, this difference affected little the life of the "Godmen." Upon their arrival in New York, Chaikovsky and Malikov, like Frey before them, were forced to the conclusion that the New Continent was a new world only in a certain limited sense. The problems that confronted them—how to live, what to do with themselves—were not to be solved by merely moving into a free country. The problem of how to live, not in a philosophical or religious sense, but in a practical one, faced them even more sharply than it had formerly in Russia. They could see that although in America all people were equal there was, nevertheless, a small practical inequality between, for instance, a cabman in St. Louis and Cornelius Vanderbilt who had \$110,000,000.

The "Godmen" had considerably less money. Their plans at first were rather vague. They wanted to lead a life of labor, but what type of labor to choose? It seemed best to engage in agriculture. They may have had an inherited love for the soil, Malikov's forebears having been peasants and Chaikovsky's—landowners, but they themselves were not very familiar with the cultivation of the land.

9Thomas Carlyle, Sir Walter Scott.

They knew about Geins, about the peculiarity of his emigration, about his views and his activity. By the time the "Godmen" arrived, William Frey had already had considerable experience in American and international communes. I shall not relate these experiences, although Frey's archives contain more material about his first ventures than about the Russian Commune in Kansas. I shall only say that Malikov and Chaikovsky soon joined Frey. At that time, land in some of the states of America sold for an absurdly low price—from one to one and a half dollars an acre. The "Godmen" bought a piece of land near Wichita. In the Kansas archives one may probably find information as to the exact location of the house of the Russian Commune, as to the place where it stood, or perhaps even where it stands

to the present day.

William Frey moved to this house and at once began to play a leading rôle. I once wrote that I was unhappy enough never in my life to have seen a single fanatic. However, if fanatics do exist, then William Frey came very close to the type. He was a man of strong will. He overpowered Chaikovsky and even Malikov by his deep force of conviction. They were wavering, "seeking" people. Frey sought absolutely nothing—he had found Comte. All the truth of the world was contained in Comte's religion of humanity. By the way, John Stuart Mill believed the doctrine laid down in the Traité de politique positive to be one of the most despotic doctrines in history. Did it appeal to Frey because his was a despotic nature, or did he behave despotically because he followed Comte's doctrine? I do not know. One should not, of course, exaggerate here the meaning of the word "despotism." Naturally, the Commune was being built on the principles of freedom, and Frey, a man of the highest integrity, could not, and of course did not, wish to exert any pressure or compulsion. But by the very nature of his character he could not avoid becoming the leader and even a rather intolerant one.

They sowed corn and wheat. They probably harvested it. Perhaps they even sold it. But still there was no money in the common purse. The house was dilapidated, full of cracks and holes. There were cows, but no one knew how to milk them and so they sickened. There was no place to keep food and it spoiled. The cooking was very poor, but this was not of great importance. Frey's views on food were as peculiar as all else about him. His general postulate was that food should not be so tasty as to develop greediness in man. There were also specific food regulations. Alcoholic beverages were, of course, forbidden in the Commune, as well as

C

h

il

a

r

n

a

tl

b

tl

0

C

an

A

re

k

T

d

C

W

o'k

fo

st

01

ar

m

Si

meat (in this Frey differed from Comte who was not a vegetarian). Coffee, tea, sugar, and even salt were also not allowed. Frey's basic theory was that one should eat only that food which could be used in its natural state. He condemned raised bread and baked some kind of sticks of flour and water which were called "Frey's cones." This was the chief food of the family. He was told that there was an inconsistency here; flour did not grow ready-made, for the grain had to be threshed from the ear. He replied that the grain would have dropped out of the ear itself when ripe. He was told that to be consistent one should go naked, because clothing is not found in the stores of nature. He answered that to go about naked would in fact be reasonable; before the arrival of Chaikovsky and Malikov, Frey lived in another commune with a German, Trueman, who did go naked until the neighboring American farmers rose in protest. All in all, it was difficult to convince Frey through logic, especially as the "Godmen" were in entire agreement with the spirit, if not the letter of his asceticism.

Worse was the moral side of their life. It was decided that the members would have no secrets from each other. If a husband whispered with his wife, it aroused protests. Besides, once a week, on Wednesdays, meetings of mutual criticism were held. Member A of the Commune would say, for instance, that member B had washed the plates badly on Monday. Finally, public confession was introduced. Each member informed all the others of his sins for the week, as, for instance, that he had in word or thought criticized one of his brothers, having forgotten for the moment the divine element in

both their souls.

Not a few complications that arose were due to the wives and the children. At one time the American authorities became interested in this aspect of the strange Russian colony. Someone was sent to investigate. Explanations were given which satisfied the public opinion of Kansas—the "Godmen" lived each with his own wife. I shall not linger on the intimate relations in their lives, although Frey's papers furnish material on this matter. At any rate, there was, of course, no question of any "socialization of women." The complications caused by the families were for the most part of a different and very comprehensible nature. In view of the communal housekeeping, the crowded conditions, the dull, uneventful and hard life, the wives soon began to quarrel and express their dissatisfaction. Some found that "Frey's cones" and the other foods of the Commune were not so indispensable to moral perfection. Others complained because the

children caught cold and became ill in the draughty, ramshackle house. Frey did not believe in any medicine that could not be found in nature in ready form. One of the riots against him was carried

out under the slogan "quinine!"

1

f

d

The upbringing of the children also provoked criticism. Frey was a kind man but easily irritated. His diaries are full, if not of sharp, then at least of very critical remarks about his fellow-members in the communes. It is true these diaries are of other periods (1870-2 and 1882), and his remarks refer to other people, but it must be presumed that the "Godmen" also often provoked him. His own little daughter caused him irritation. In one place of his diary we read: "The little girl must have been tired. . . She nearly drove me mad telling me over and over again about . . . [One word illegible. M.A.] children." Besides, Frey believed that it was necessary first of all to develop in a child patience, attention, and orderliness. He therefore set his daughter tasks such as to multiply twenty-five billion two-hundred million by some other many-million amount. If the child cried or was unwilling, he would pour a pail of cold water over her. Chaikovsky, present at one such lesson and punishment, could not contain himself and cried in rage: "You, Mr. Frey, are an idiot. . ." I don't know whether Frey was offended. Probably not. All that he did was based on the unquestionable doctrine of Auguste Comte.

As I write these lines I am assailed by a doubt. May not the reader think that the censorious epithet which escaped from Chaikovsky was deserved, that Frey and his friends of the Commune were indeed idiots, or at the least, dull and unintelligent people? This would be quite incorrect. Of course, there is no more indefinite conception than "intelligence." Thomas à Kempis, Newton, Oliver Cromwell, Mark Twain, Pierpont Morgan, Dostoevsky, all were undoubtedly intelligent people, but each one of them had his own form of intelligence, which practically excluded any other. I knew Chaikovsky well, and I can certify that his was that higher form of intelligence which is called wisdom. He himself saw his strength in instinct, in intuition, which prompted him to find the right approach to life and to people; I heard him say this more than once and it was perfectly true. Of Malikov's intelligence, ability, and, what sounds especially strange, his sense of humor, there are many witnesses among the above named widely diversified people who knew him well. And Tolstoy himself, a competent witness, considered Frey to be an outstanding man of great charm. The members of the Kansas Commune had a peculiar form of intelligence, which has nearly disappeared in our time and now arouses amazement.

la

si

be

be

m

an

CI

m

pe

w

Fi

ko

a :

so

ha

mi

int

no

no

04

Its

for

date

Arnold Bennet in his "Diary," speaking of the well-known memoirs of the Russian revolutionary, Prince Kropotkin, writes: "... He is really very reticent about himself. . . A very simple and straightforward character. Discusses very simply everything that comes in his way. . . Never seems to 'dress his window' . . . He never seeks an effect. Evidently he and his friends were of a morality far higher than even the average highly moral. On the whole I should say his life was a happy one." To some extent these true words could apply to some other, though not very numerous, representatives of that same Russian generation to which Kropotkin belonged. But as Malikov said in his old age: "Everyone goes crazy in his own way." All the spiritual endeavors of the people gathered together in the Kansas Commune were concentrated on burrowing in their own souls (and in the souls of others), on perfecting themselves and watching the progress of self-improvement. They registered their acts, their thoughts, their impulses, with the same exactitude, pedantry, and interest with which a broker watches the stock market. They would doubtlessly have been amazed if they had been told that there were other values in the world besides the virtues of Mr. A or the progress in self-perfection of Mr. B. "Le malheur veut que qui veut faire l'ange fait la bête," says Pascal. I shall not say that this happened in the Kansas colony. But it is easy to guess that life there soon became unbearable. They quarreled over each unwashed plate, over each extra morsel eaten to the detriment, not of the treasury of the Commune, but of the moral progress of the sinner. Frankness carried to extremes, as could also be expected, aroused mutual hatred among some of the members. There became evident too that feeling which goes by the name of "healthy egoism." One of the mothers whose child was sick broke out with an exclamation which practically meant—let the Commune go to the devil if only my child gets well! Probably she was duly called to order at the next meeting of self-criticism. But possibly there were a few who felt that Mrs. B was not the only culprit in the Commune. Many years later, Malikov used to say: "With what shame one recalls many episodes of this life!" Practically the same was said to me by Chaikovsky, though in a more restrained and milder form.

To all the above-mentioned was added another aggravating cir-

¹⁰ The Journal of Arnold Bennet, New York, 1933. p. 326.

cumstance which had not been foreseen by the "Godmen." In Russia they had believed they were "smothering" and had yearned to go abroad. Abroad, these Russians suffered a torture of homesickness. One day, during a reading of Lermontov's poem "I love my Fatherland, but with a love so strange," with its famous description of Russian fields, forests, roads, and villages, there was something resembling a scene of mass hysteria. Many cried, others ran out of the room. Probably, from the first days of the Commune, some of the members were nursing secret thoughts of a return to their fatherland.

Obviously, the whole affair ended as it had to end: the Commune

began to disintegrate and died a natural death.

III.

This experience showed first of all that one can start out with the most varied philosophical and religious premises and reach similar and similarly strange practical deductions: Frey came to the Kansas Commune through positivism, Malikov—through "Godmanhood," Chaikovsky—through vague idealism. It became clear also that communes of this type could not have the slightest influence on the people surrounding them and, even less, on the life of society as a whole. This, however, was exactly what they had dreamed of. In Frey's papers there is an interesting letter written to him by Chaikovsky much later, from London.¹¹

"Much strength was taken from us by religious dreams, but they also gave us much," wrote Chaikovsky. "Russian society sought struggle and political life, and we sought religion and believed that a socialistic religion of unparalleled perfection once found would solve the problem. The light once shown to the world, the light it has searched for in immeasurable suffering, through the grievous mistakes of so many centuries, it would fly straight at it like a moth into candlelight. Of the possibility of a full life for ourselves we had no doubts. The result was what it could not help but be: a dream, no matter how enchanting and theoretically true, but formed without reference to conditions of time and place, remained but a dream. Its truth, however, for the people of the future I still do not doubt for a moment." 12

¹¹The letter is dated September 24, October 20, November 13. The first two dates are crossed out; no year is given, but apparently it was written in 1880.

¹² The italics are Chaikovsky's.

Psychologically, the communal experiment showed that man was not created to live in a glass house. Such a life brings him no benefit, to say nothing of pleasure. No good, likewise, is derived from public confessions in a commune. Their result, in the best case, may be a magnificent literary work, which, however, from St. Augustine to Leo Tolstoy, has never contained in itself the whole truth. But

n

h

a

it

h

CC

er

ar

in

cu

y

cu

ly

of

pe

pa

de

So

tea

in

W

of

ast

No

Ru

int

Sim

the Russian "Godmen" had no literary talents.

Most of them returned to Russia. Malikov lived peaceably in his homeland until 1904, tenderly loved by a small group of people. He did not achieve fame. He is not mentioned either in the old Russian Encyclopedia of Brockhaus and Effron, or in the Big Soviet Encyclopedia. He made his peace with the Orthodox Church and became its faithful follower. He earned a living for himself and his numerous family in a modest post with the railways. Tolstoy, who liked and valued him, used to say with concealed irony that it had not been worthwhile to go so far as Kansas to end one's life like Malikov.

Chaikovsky's fate was different. He left the Kansas Commune, left it without even money enough for a railway ticket, and walked the 420 miles to Philadelphia in 23 days. There he found a job, hard and poorly paid. Ahead of him lay a long and varied life. Chaikovsky settled in London where he spent a quarter of a century. His life there was not sweet. "Hunger—that is our ill and the general ill of the Russian emigration," he writes in the same letter to Frey. "For two months already all the five of us literally have not known whether we shall have something to chew upon tomorrow. . . And my poor children! Alas, it hurts even to speak of it. But you know it all yourself." He was cured of communal life forever, but he continued to change his views, while always remaining a deeply sincere man of high integrity and a perfect gentleman. In Europe he soon reached the conclusion that political struggle for freedom was indispensable. "All kinds of half-measures, such as moralism, the mushy propaganda of ideals, good example, all have no serious value and can in no way influence the life of society." Later he joined the Social-Revolutionary Party; in 1905 he returned to Russia. In 1917, he became one of the leaders of the Popular Socialist Labor Party, the most moderate of the Russian leftist groups, and played not a small rôle in the events of the Russian Revolution. In 1918 he was the head of the anti-Bolshevik government of the Northern Region; in January 1919 he left for Paris. At the time of the Paris peace negotiations, after the First World War, he was the only Russian consulted by President Wilson. In emigration, Chaikovsky headed the "Center of Action," an active anti-Bolshevik organization. He died in London in 1925, having reached the age of seventy-five. In his letter of farewell he wrote: "My last moments have come. If God wills, I shall go with a light spirit and with gratitude for everything that I experienced in this world. It moves eternally ahead, always perfecting itself. . ."

William Frey also moved to Europe from the United States and also settled in London. Unlike Chaikovsky, however, he preserved his faith in the "mushy propaganda of ideals." As a non-revolutionary, Frey could visit Russia during the reign of Alexander III, and it was then that he became acquainted with Tolstoy and talked with

him.18

"

st

7-

nt

ne

I have already mentioned the fact that Frey seriously hoped to convert Tolstoy to the positivist faith. His failure to do this apparently brought him to the verge of rage. His notebook is full of sharp and absurd accusations against Tolstoy. Tolstoy is guilty of not having found it necessary to leave all his work and spend his time discussing Comte's theories in his, Frey's, interpretation. "What would you say of a man," writes Frey, "to whom one writes the most circumstantial and lengthy treatises on positivism, asking that he analyze them in detail, and who avoids it by writing two or three pages of kind and complimentary words on my behalf and continues to repeat his old ideas as though these letters had never existed. For my part, I can understand nothing in this example of Christian behavior. . . . It seems that Leo Tolstoy imagines himself too great to condescend to a painstaking and detailed analysis of positivism. . ." Some of Frey's remarks on Tolstoy, on Tolstoism, on the Christian teachings, I simply do not find it possible to print.

In London, Frey became a member of the Society of Positivists. He earned his living at first by typographical work and later by baking some kind of special bread which conformed to his views. It would have been difficult to acquire riches by this means, but Frey, of course, thought least of all of money. He lived an ascetic life, astonishing the poor of London by his poverty and his good cheer. Not only they, but the British professors-positivists regarded this Russian aristocrat who fed on "cones" and lived exclusively in the interests of his mind, as an incomprehensible phenomenon. Frey died

¹⁸I believe that it was Frey whom Tolstoy had in mind when he portrayed Simonson in Resurrection.

of some serious illness in great suffering. There is a picture of him on the last day of his life, drawn by P. A. Kropotkin, in which he looks like a living skeleton, something like Gandhi. The English followers of Comte honored Frey's memory by speeches and reports read

at meetings of their Positivist Society.

Among Frey's papers is the manuscript of his will. I give a few paragraphs: "Now a few words about myself or rather about my body. If I die in the country, I would like to be buried in a place which can be fenced in and to have one or two fruit trees planted on it. . . But if I die in town, then, knowing what trouble and expense are involved in burying a man, I positively command that my body be given to some medical school, if it takes upon itself all the expenses of transportation. . . [Two words are illegible. M.A.] and that my poor tired heart be placed in a jar of alcohol and given to my family for safekeeping. . . All the rest can go under the scalpels of the young men. It goes without saying that whether my body is buried in the earth or goes to the students, it must be clothed in nothing but a long shirt and covered only with a sheet. I deem it a crime to bury in the ground shoes or clothing that can decently be worn by living people. . . May the Religion of Mankind support you, my dear ones, in the hour of trial. Be worthy of that Great Religion, which you must spread among others."

Four Poems By Tyutchev*

Translated from the Russian By VLADIMIR NABOKOV

THE JOURNEY

Knee-deep, this powdery sand. . . We ride late in the murky day.

Shadows cast by the pines have now merged to form one shadow across our way.

Blacker and denser the wildwood grows. What a comfortless neighborhood!

Moody night peers like a hundred-eyed beast out of every bush in the wood.

APPEASEMENT

The storm withdrew, but Thor had found his oak, and there it lay magnificently slain, and from its limbs a remnant of blue smoke spread to bright trees repainted by the rain—while thrush and oriole made haste to mend their broken melodies throughout the grove, upon the crests of which was propped the end of a virescent rainbow edged with mauve.

^{*}Fedor Ivanovich Tyutchev (1803-1873) was a great lyrical and metaphysical poet of nineteenth-century Russia [Ed.].

DUSK

Now the ashen shadows mingle, tints are faded, sounds remote. Life has dwindled to a single vague reverberating note. In the dusk I hear the humming of a moth I cannot see. Whence is this oppression coming? I'm in all, and all's in me. Gloom so dreary, gloom so lulling, flow into my deepest deep, flow, ambrosial and dulling, steeping everything in sleep. With oblivion's obscuration fill my senses to the brim, make me taste obliteration, in this dimness let me dim.

TEARS

m

th sw tic

cit

al

ba

an

Human tears, O the tears! you that flow when life is begun—or half-gone, tears unseen, tears unknown, you that none can number or drain, you that run like the streamlets of rain from the low clouds of Autumn, long before dawn. . .

Soviet War Poetry

By VERA SANDOMIRSKY

To THE grief of translators words have souls. It is possible to find a corresponding shell in another language, but the soul of a word as frequently as not escapes.

Thus, the word rodina in Russian means neither motherland nor fatherland, neither homeland nor native land. Native land comes closest in meaning, but in Russian it is a word overflowing with emo-

tion, with a peculiarly Russian warmth and tenderness.

It is well known that the word *rodina* fell in disgrace and disappeared from the language of poetry during the years of revolution, civil war, and early reconstruction. That it was reinstated in the middle thirties, long before what in the Soviet Union is today called the Great Patriotic War, is also well known. It came back on a sweeping wave of nationalism, which was not suppressed but sanctioned from above. In 1941, moreover, *rodina* became the highest symbol of unification, the banner for a whole nation.

There is no poet in Russia today (and they are legion, young ones, hitherto unknown, soldiers, workers, girls left behind in besieged cities, who write and sing poetry under the impact of this greatest of all Russian, if not human, tragedies), who does not unite under this banner. And usually rodina is linked with the adjective that becomes an organic part of it—sviashchénnaya—meaning sacred or holy.

Over our happiness circles a bird of prey, But in a stern, unbending formation Peoples fight for life, for honor, for friendship, For their motherland, sacred, theirs . . . ¹

During the war years innumerable collections and anthologies of songs and poetry have been published. No matter where one opens these books one finds the same theme:

¹V. Gusev. Vedut narody boi (Peoples Fight), in the collection Za rodinu, Za Stalina (For Motherland, for Stalin), 1941.

Characteristic of the generation that is the backbone of Russia today are the words of a young poet, B. Zakharchenko:

E

he

to

ba

isi

th

co

co

Be

10

bin

Ri

of

by

mi

So

de

do

ow

the

lov

the in i

5

Bullets whistled when we were born.
We matured and shells drone again. . .
And I am proud that I live in such years
When the parental home does not shelter.
We safeguard happiness through storm—
We hold the motherland on our shoulders.

These samples, typical of the general run of verse writing, sound loud and cliché-like. It is obvious that greater poets, although speaking about the same thing, escape the cliché easier:

They attacked us, enraged,
Threatening with the cold of graves.
But there is such a word—to resist,
When to resist is impossible.
And there is the soul—it will bear all.
And there is mother-earth, she alone is
Great, kind, angry,
Salty and warm like blood.

But even these lines of the old veteran Ilya Ehrenburg are loud and high-pitched. One does not often hear in this eruption of patriotic outcries, which as a whole betray a certain fixed and acclaimed pattern—even if we do not doubt their sincerity—an intimately tender, choked voice. When one does, it is all the more moving. Konstantin Simonov, who became one of the most popular and beloved "front poets," discovers his strength and his individuality through war. He says in one of his poems, dedicated to his friend Aleksei Surkov, another popular frontovik:

²I. Mosashvili. Pesnya moryaka (Song of a Sailor) ibid.

⁸B. Zakharchenko. ibid.

⁴Ilya Ehrenburg. Stikhi o voine (Poems about War), 1943.

Elsewhere Simonov says that to him rodina means also three birches he remembers from his childhood. Every Russian has three birches to remember. They can mean more than sickle and hammer, the red banner, the five-pointed star, the constitution, even more than heroism. It is the knowledge of where one belongs on a deeper level. The more one reads Simonov, who has affinities with Sergei Esenin, the more one is inclined to believe that in his development he discovered something different from many Russian war poets who compulsively write in a constant fortissimo. He discovered something that is not an abstraction. To him and to Surkov, Shchipachev, Bergolz, Aliger, and to a few other lyrical poets of the younger set, rodina is flesh and blood, it is childhood, it is first love, it is three birches which do not remain only a symbol. Above all rodina means Russian people. Thus, it is also the peasant who is the incarnation of an unchanging attachment to the soil. This sacred soil was raped by the Fascists. And it is the Russian peasant, forgotten and at times misunderstood during the turbulent and convulsive years of the Soviet era, who taught, without necessarily having taken courses in politgramota [political literacy], how to cling to this soil, how to defend it. He teaches the poet what rodina can be.

In the poem quoted above, we heard Simonov in a subdued tone. This was an expression of longing rather than of pain. He was tenderly lyrical and at his best. But he can also cry and scream. He must do so. For when identification with the "sacred fight" and with one's own people is strong enough, when in one's ideological makeup there is no trace of doubt as to the rightness of one's cause, when love for *rodina* transcends chauvinism, abstraction, and slogans—then this love culminates in boundless hatred against the aggressor, in invocations of revenge.

nt

v,

Konstantin Simonov. S toboi i bez tebya (With You and Without You), 1943.

... If you don't want to give away The one you walked with together, The one whom you didn't dare For a long time to kiss Because you loved her so much, If you don't want the Germans To take her by force, clutched in a corner, To crucify her, three at a time, Naked, on the floor, If you don't want the three dogs to get In moans, hatred, in blood All that you so tenderly worshiped With the strength of your masculine love. . . If you don't want to give away to the German, With the black gun of his, The house where you lived, your wife, your mother, All that we motherland call, Know—no one will save her Unless you save her yourself. Know-no one will kill him Unless you kill him yourself. And until you kill him, Don't talk about your love. Do not call motherland The place of your childhood, The house of your own. If your brother kills a German, If your neighbor kills a German— This is your brother's and neighbor's vengeance, You-vou have no excuse. One doesn't hide behind another's back, One doesn't avenge with the gun of another. So kill him. . . .

On

hov

Re

A

pro

7]

Aleksei Surkov, very much akin to Simonov, entitles the most impressive volume of his poetry *Verses of Hatred*. The leitmotif is expressed in the following poem:

Konstantin Simonov. Ubei ego (Kill him), Stikhotvoreniya (Poems), 1936-42.

My anger, not knowing limits, Will repay him blood for blood, For the ruined parental roof, For my trampled crop, For the gardens I have grown, For the short-lived fate of my son And for each drink of water Out of my White Russian streams.

The same theme finds a concise expression in one of Ehrenburg's particularly untranslatable poems that he calls "Hatred"—sertsa vysokii holod—the high cold of the heart.

Hatred. Dim January midday.
Ice and a clot of a frozen sun.
Ice. Under it gurgles the river.
The mouth is stuffed. The hand speaks.
Now there is no porch, no smoke,
No warmth from the beloved one's shoulder,
No longing. Only ice and foe.
Hatred—high cold of the heart.
Everything passed, went by, is split.
The bullet aimed from the heart will find the heart,
When the pink ice will barely start smoking.

One can call it also the "high flame of the heart" when Surkov tells how somewhere on the front, during the victorious return of the Red Army, a group of soldiers start a fire near an empty pillbox. A young peasant woman with a two-year old child in her arms approaches them.

... I saw the sapper turn blind with tears
When the child laughing and sobbing
Grabbed with his thin arms the soldier's bread
And chewed it hastily, with greed.

You shall never forget, soldier, The swollen, feeble arms, The vagrant, unchildish eyes And the blue mouth of that one boy.

⁷Ilya Ehrenburg. Stikhi o voine (Poems about War), 1943.

Your bitter work saved him from death, Returned to life his sickly, feeble body. To you and me and every one of us Our country ordained not to forgive offenses.

Across the river you will meet the German, In a black pillbox ditch like this And nothing will you have under the hand, Then with your teeth you will clutch his throat.

You will bite and tear and strangle Until he will turn whiter than chalk, Until his murderous soul, A reptile's soul, will quit his body.

The poet cannot stand aside. It is not enough to observe. He must participate. If he participates, something happens to his art:

ti

E

of

po

ot

ar

Warmth of a home doesn't await the children, Dead grass is flooded by blood. And look, into my verses come again Straight and cruel words.

In the same volume we find glimpses of memory like these:

Crowds of people, without end and count, Came to our encounter in pre-morning dawn. I remember; an old woman led a goatling, A child carried in her slender arms A small consumptive plant of geranium. Nightly terror chased them out of cities, Fire raged behind their back.

It seems impossible to dissect, evaluate, and judge such poetry. We sense be it only one thing: when *rodina* embraces fear for one's girl left behind, when it becomes the blue mouth and the glassy stare of a hungry child, when it becomes even something like a consumptive geranium plant—the poet touches at the core of the greatest of

^{*}Aleksei Surkov. Stikhi o nenavisti (Poems of Hatred), 1943.

⁹Aleksei Surkov, ibid.

human tragedies. Such poetry should become national art. Whether the young Russian poets have proven completely adequate for such a gigantic task is premature to judge now.

A man bent down to the water And saw suddenly that he was grey. The man was twenty years of age. Over the forest brook he gave the oath To execute unmercifully and with fury Those people that pour to the East. Who will dare to condemn him If he will turn cruel in the fight? 10

Who is this man who turned grey? It is a man of Surkov's generation, Russia's youth:

... From early youth we dreamed of peace, Of a quiet hour of calm, But fate threw in our lap four Long, exhausting, trying wars. . .¹¹

Even the younger ones, those that did not participate in all the four wars, those that are twenty years old today—even those turned grey. Much of today's war poetry is drenched with this prematurity of grief and sorrow. It runs like a hidden stream through the poetry that sings of faith, of utmost heroism, and of the will to live. And those of the better poets who turned grey can't help but at times express irritation with loud and stereotype outbursts of patriotism. Here is the mood of one of the most lyrical older revolutionary poets, Iosif Utkin:

AT THE FIRE

Loud talking here, comrade, is not in fashion, Clamorous songs are out, by all means. . . And if you are asked to read at the fire Something of your own, as it's done here at times,

¹⁰ Aleksei Surkov. ibid.

¹¹Aleksei Surkov. Voyennaya Osen' (War Autumn), 1942.

Read to them verses about Russia without shouting,
About Russia's love for her soldiers, her own,
How their children love them, their wives remember. . .
You will instantly hear the snow and the trees—
All this life overstrained, winnowed
By the frost of the forest silence. . .
Believing, not at once, the truth of your words,
Their attentive circle will exchange glances,
A gay young fire, sparkling, flying to all,
And someone, getting lively, will add wood to the fire,
And someone, embarrassed, will straighten his gun.

It is not enough to turn grey over personal or witnessed suffering, it is not enough to invoke vengeance—

... For the pressed mouth of your wife,
For the years that are burned,
For the lack of sleep and of walls,
For the sobs of children, for the moans of sirens,
For ikons, for even they
Have cried their eyes dry.¹²

This alone is not enough. The poet finds himself searching for sincerity, for individualism in poetic expression. His road leads him either to intimately lyrical, personal imagery, or to the more difficult attempts at epic poetry. By now there seem to emerge cycles of epics born out of the collective tragedies of besieged cities. Not so much men as Moscow, Leningrad, Stalingrad, Sevastopol become heroes. The most remarkable of these cycles is the one of the Leningrad defense, to which such poets as Vera Inber, Nikolai Tikhonov, and Olga Bergolz have contributed. The boundaries between epic and lyric poetry are by no means rigid. Today less so than ever. A Soviet literary critic makes this point rather clear: ". . . The heroic epic of our days is through and through lyrical. Poetical terminology must include such, at the first glance, paradoxical definitions as 'lyrical epic' and, on the other hand, 'epical lyric.' The boundaries between epic and lyric (vacillating at all times, one must say) become at the present more and more mobile and unclear. . .

T

b

ir

fi

C

m

V

p

S

25

¹² Ilya Ehrenburg. Stikhi o voine.

A poem about the native land sounds like something private, and something private that gains social resonance." 18

To be good, to be significant, this private, personal, and intimate expression must be really personal and intimate; it must not shy from the minute details of which life and art are made.

Wait a little, wait!

I'll tell my sorrow of the brook called Vorya
And of limpid rains that fell in it.

Of the big fat fish, I'll tell my sorrow
Which for hours lay near by a sunken tree,

I'll tell how hurrying toward bushy thickets,

Burned by the sun and with a song,
Far ahead of us, the fate of two deciding,
In the light of ripening corn,
There came mighty love,

Love that travelled the whole world. Surely, I can out-argue sorrow

0

le

1-

10

r.

e

al

i-

ne st Since I firmly know that in that battle In your soul you kept the brook called Vorya, Our happiness—our motherland.¹⁴

These are lines of a young Leningrad poetess speaking to her husband, who was, if I am not wrong, killed at the front. Here again in the magic of a forlorn little Russian brook called Vorya, of a fat fish that inhabited it, of the memory of young love under ripening corn—here again we feel that this particular, personal, intimate memory is the true content of *rodina* which gives strength to survive even to those who turned grey. This also makes poetry which people need in their darkest hour, poetry that is lyric or epic, personal or collective, or whatever we may call it, as long as it is felt, as long as it is lived, as long as it is true. What is felt cannot be mon-

¹⁸L. Polyak. O 'liricheskom epose' velikoi otechestvennoi voiny (About "lyrical epic" of the Great Patriotic War), Znamya (Standard), 1943.

¹⁴Margarita Aliger. Iz Kazanskoi tetradi (Out of the Kasan Notebook), 1943.

ne

dy

in

m

la

ar

so.

T

th

SO

m

m

of

sti

va

m

L

te

fie

to

nie

im

or fo

en

of

an

it th

ue

olithic and of one facet. Not all is innocent suffering and righteous heroism. The feeling of guilt at the initial retreat of the Red Army breaks through the chorus of heroic songs. Here again we turn to Simonov.

When you enter your town And women meet you, Holding their children high Over their heads turned grey;

Even if you are a hero—Don't be proud. This day
Of entering the town you did not
Deserve gratitude from them,
But only forgiveness.

The only thing you did Is to return that frightful debt Which you contracted that year When your retreating batallion Gave them away to slavery.¹⁵

The war brought a rebirth of poetry. With the possible exception of war reporting, which is frequently done by poets, in emotional pathos and strength it holds, so far, the supremacy over prose. The same thing happened twenty-seven years ago when the Revolution found its immediate expression in a sweeping poetic revival. It lasted roughly from 1917 to 1925. At the beginning of this revolutionary

period prose almost disappeared.

In Russia poetry has seldom been written "by a few for a few." At least it has not been traditional to adhere to the ivory tower or "l'art pour l'art" theory. Exceptions can be found, of course, in individual poets as well as in schools. But, in general, it seems that poetry, hand in hand with the tradition of Russian prose, reflects life—everyday's and everybody's. During the Revolution, life of a people was clenched in gigantic, catastrophic labor pains of rebirth. These people needed poetry, strange as it may seem. Poetry was born reflecting, singing, yelling the Revolution. It seems that the

¹⁵K. Simonov. Vozvrashchenie v gorod (Return to the Town), Znamya, 1943.

need for poetry arises right there and then during a national cata-

dysm.

Poetry of the Revolution, which of necessity became revolutionary, was written in trenches and in factories. It was recited in mass meetings and on street corners. Today's war poetry erupted in pretty much the same way. The need is similar; the way of creation is similar. Again it is written by soldiers in the front lines on margins of army newspapers. Aleksei Surkov tells that the most poignant moment of his creative life was when he found in a pocket of a dead soldier the clipping of a very popular poem by Simonov, "Wait for Me," together with one of his own, and letters of the soldier's wife. This same poetry is recited again in the factory mass meetings of the besieged cities, in spite of bombardments. Again it is sung. This

time, incidentally, it is more song-like and singable.

It is impossible not to be moved by this outburst of love for one's soil, for one's people, for rodina. Its sincerity is beyond doubt. One must be blind to suspect only propaganda in it, this time of a national denomination. True, much of this poetry is technically poor verse, much of it lacks in "between-the-lines suspense," in subtlety. Much of it is too loud, too obvious, too repetitious. True, better poetry is still written by the older masters. But somehow, if we consider the vast growth of war poetry as a whole, it seems petty, indecent, almost impossible to approach it with dissecting instruments of literary criticism. If this poetry witnesses and reflects the struggle of Leningrad, Stalingrad, and Sevastopol, if the poets who were there tell us that Russia knew what she was fighting for, if this poetry defies physical death as the Red soldier does—it seems inappropriate to complain about its lack of variety and subtlety in form, in technique, in diction.

Whether written by an ex-acmeist (Anna Akhmatova), an eximaginist (Vera Inber), an ex-futurist (Semyon Kirsanov), an exconstructivist (Ilya Selvinsky), whether it is written by the younger or youngest set—as a whole—this poetry gains the features of a folk song or a folk epic. Here we can point out the striking difference in comparison to the poetry which was written under the banner

of Revolutsiya (Revolution).

Revolutionary poetry was cosmic, messianic, collective. It was anti-traditional, anti-poetic, anti-lyrical. It was necessarily so, since it was a truly revolutionary poetry, which was generated long before the Revolution, and which participated in the smashing of old values. In creating new values, it was ferociously opposed to everything

ex

no

mo

bra

abl

her

of

ado

day

int

one

or

It

of

the

poo sel

exp

fair

Ru

fai

ref

the

end

end

iro

me of

son

fer

for

juc

wit

of the immediate past, and particularly to the decadent, aloof, bloodless individualism of the decaying Symbolism. In creating new values, it became above all a loud-speaker for collective feelings, aspirations, and experiences. It became We poetry. The intimate, personal, lyrical I-feelings and emotions were more or less taboo. This was not only the official attitude of the literary law-makers, but also an organic necessity. It is obvious that "personal" poetry was also written. Boris Pasternak, perhaps the greatest Russian poet living, created even in those turbulent years in a rarified atmosphere of isolation; Sergei Esenin, the flaxen haired, blue-eyed peasant poet personified Weltschmerz lyricism; and even the loudest of all "collective" poets, the futurist Vladimir Mayakovsky, slipped frequently into concern about his personal pains. But when such lyrical expressions occurred, the poet was called a fellow-traveler, a nonconformist. And indeed such a poet was still something of an outcast, of a marginal man. In the main bulk of poetry, however, there was a large uniformity in content. There was the triumphant song of the revolutionary army and the collective hymn to the proletarian future. In spite of uniformity as to themes, a profuse experimenting with form took place. The new search for expression and new values had to be expressed in new forms. Numerous schools, many of which were conceived in the pre-revolutionary years, battled on the field of literary criticism, since practically every major poet was also a theorist for his school. Groups and sub-groups were formed of futurists and neo-futurists, acmeists, imagists, constructivists, neo-romanticists, peasant poets, factory poets, and Komsomol poets.

If revolutionary poetry was in its aspirations cosmic, collective, messianic, today's poetry under the banner of *rodina* is, in its general traits, national, immediate, personal. If revolutionary poetry in its search for form was anti-traditional, anti-poetic, anti-lyrical, today's

poetry is highly poetic, un-revolutionary, traditional.

Discussing Mayakovsky's best pupil Semyon Kirsanov, Alexander Kaun says that he is now on his way from Mayakovsky to Pushkin.¹⁶ This is true not only of Kirsanov. All poetry today is on the way from Mayakovsky to Pushkin, from revolution to tradition. In fact, it almost arrived.

This poetry narrates primarily the tragic and heroic experiences of individuals, soldiers, defense workers, peasants, guerillas, women and children, confronted with the onslaught of Fascists. Above all it

¹⁶ Alexander Kaun. Soviet Poets and Poetry, 1943.

expresses the rise of the human spirit and conquest of death. But it is no longer a collective experience in which the person remains anonymous. Such poetry can be called collective only inasmuch as it embraces, in a form of plurality, individual heroism, be it the unshakable faith of an old illiterate peasant woman who prays and sends her sons to the fight with a sign of the Orthodox cross, be it the pride of a sailor for his Red Navy overcoat, be it the martyrdom of an adolescent Komsomol girl caught by the Nazis. The best poems today are written in the first person singular. The best poetry is lyrical, intimate, tender. One is no longer ashamed to love one's wife and one's child; one's own child—and not the totality of the Komsomol or the Pioneer movement.

The poetry of 1917 gave voice to postulates of a new ideology. It had to become in many respects dogmatic, if only for the reason of clarification of new values. It was collective because the carrier of the new ideology was the newborn mass. The hero of this collective poetry was the collective man, the Utopian man of the future. The self as such was submerged, ignored, carried away by the enthusiastic

expectation of the New.

d-

1-

S-

e,

0.

ut

as

V-

of et

ll

e-

al

n-

It-

re

of

an

ng

les

ch ld

2

11-

0-

e,

its y's

er 16

ay ct,

ces

en

it

Today's poetry tells us of fears, agony, death, hope, and stern faith of individuals. It can be called collective because millions of Russians share the same agony, the same death, the same hope and faith. Thus, poetry becomes in the last instance collective because it reflects the survival of Russia through the millionfold repetition of the same faith which gave strength. But there is a profound difference in these two attitudes toward collective experience: the self submerged in the collectivity and the self symbolizing the experience of millions.

"... Soviet poets of our days have thrown away ascetic shackles, iron chains with which they have burdened themselves in the immediate past... In the poetry of our days the call to the defense of the motherland is at the same time the call to the defense of personal, individual, human happiness. And vengeance for personal suffering merges into vengeance for the suffering of a nation..." 17

What happened to the search for new form? It is perhaps a loss and a gain at the same time that innovations and experiments with form completely disappeared. It is premature, however, to pass any judgment. Over artistic literature today there floats one huge sign with two rather enigmatic words as to its exact contents: Social Real-

¹⁴L. Polyak. O 'liricheskom epose' . . .

car

At

tre

mı

Th

fut

pe

ma

the

po

inr

TI

po

al

if

po

ism. Whatever the official postulate and interpretation, today it seems to be of little concern to poets. Since experimenting with form ceased, which in the long run may well turn out to be an artistic loss, there came about a strange uniformity of verse writing. Poetry became interchangeable. From a formal aspect individual poets are unrecognizable. With a few exceptions, such as Pasternak, Selvinsky, and Kirsanov, it is difficult to tell whether a poem is written by the fiery Ehrenburg, who is in his fifties, or by Surkov, Simonov, or Shchipachev, who represent the younger generation.

Concern has been voiced recently in the Soviet Union as to whether writers and poets have proven themselves adequate for the task of recording the war in works which will survive. To this concern Ilya Ehrenburg replied in a recent article, "The Word as a Weapon." 18

". . . If in the days of war we shall not create a literature, at least we shall save it. In the life of a people there are such minutes when silence is heard. It is heard between blasts of shells. How one waited for a word from many a writer in the fall of 1941 in pill-boxes, in the peasant houses of Smolensk, on small railway stations! Let's be silent about those who remained silent. Let's remember those who wrote reports and sketches in foxholes, those who were chained to the narrow area of the frontline; let's remember those who know the front line roads, the sorrow and happiness of the soldier. Let's remember those who were with the people in their most difficult days. Let's remember friends who are killed. Let's remember all that was done by Soviet writers and let us say: we have committed many sins, but in the hours of trial we did not dodge our conscience—we fought.

"One could say: where are the beautiful and immortal books that will show to posterity our epic? Personally, I prefer passionate, fragmentary notes, lines in a front line newspaper, a poem of wrath, a diary of war to substitutes of War and Peace, about which some authors dream. Great books about the great war will be written later; participators will write them.

"To view a large canvas we take a few steps back. An epic demands distance, but distance is irreconcilable with the rhythm of war. The time will come for big books, not only in size. If, however, I still maintain that in days of war the authority of the writer be-

¹⁸I. Ehrenburg. Slovo-oruzhio (The Word as a Weapon), Novyi Mir (The New World), 1-2, 1944.

came greater, it is not because we have created majestic compositions. At times, a short note written in a hurry is more valuable than a long treatise. There are people insensitive to literature as there are to music. The voice of the writer has reached even the insensitive ones. This is the justification and joy of our ungrateful work.

"Yes, we do not have in front of us immortal tomes or marble, but rather wax; the living voice of a writer. Here is the pledge of future happiness, of future books: writers shall never abandon the

people and the people shall never part with the writers."

y

k

n

it

e

!

er

se l-

st

1-

nur

at e,

h,

ne

r;

eof

er,

e-

ew

This link with the people, the rediscovery of the simple Russian man in the heroic defender of Leningrad, in the peasant guerilla, in the private of the Red Army, speaks out of the genuinely lyrical poetry which overcame loud patriotic shouting. The examples are innumerable:

These are a few lines out of Olga Bergolz's remarkable cycle of poems on the defense of Leningrad. The poet does not want to be a hero—all she wants is to absorb, to participate, to be present. And if heroism was so much part of the tragedy, that's the kind that the poet found:

. . . We know how to sacrifice life, only one, ours.

¹⁹Olga Bergolz. Fevralskii dnevnik (February Diary), 1942.

But this one is difficult to take away from us. Then, at that moment, we do not remember all books we read, all truths we were told; we remember not all the soil, but only one patch, not all people, but only a woman on the railway station. But behind it, spreading, not knowing barriers, rises rodina composed of these patches of soil, rise people composed of friends who brought us to the station us, soldiers; clouds swim under which we all grew. . . 20

The

est,

cum

com

the

Mu

old

here

inna

with

pop ute line

hero

Brave

All poets who deserve this name sense that one does not defend an abstraction. Margarita Aliger restates what we heard from Simonov, Surkov, and Inber. Sacrificing consciously one's life, one takes inventory:

. . . Won't you really sit on the bench at the threshold of your father's house? Don't you understand, that's exactly what we rodina call. . . .

Remember the low desk and board and class, All you heard there.

Don't you understand, that's exactly what *rodina* is called.

Remember another bench, the tuft of trees, Where for the first time you waited for her. The sunburnt dream in a cotton dress For the first time then you kissed.

²⁰K. Simonov. Vecher posle boys (Evening After the Battle), Rodins (Native Land), 1942.

Will you really no longer find in the world her hair, her lips, her eyes?

Don't you understand, that's exactly what you rodina call. . . 21

The poet was at the front. There he could not fail to find the modest, real hero—unassuming, simple-hearted, adjustable to all circumstances, never losing his sense of humor nor his deep feeling of comradeship—the perennial Russian infantry soldier, recruited from the peasants. Alexander Tvardovsky, well known for his Strana Muravia (Grass Land), a witty folktale about a nonconformist old stock peasant faced with collectivization, has created now a folk hero in the series of adventures of Vasily Tyorkin. Tvardovsky's innate sense of humor does not abandon him even when he deals with tragic events. This is perhaps the reason for the tremendous popularity of his Vasily Tyorkin. Front soldiers themselves contribute to continuations of Tyorkin's adventures. Let us quote a few lines out of which we can feel the humble love of the poet for his hero:

. . . You couldn't live without tobacco From one bombing to the next. Just as much you need a by-word, Some good saying—and, of course, You couldn't live without my Tyorkin, Vasya Tyorkin—my dear hero. . . What else? That's all, I think. In a word—it's a book about a fighter, With no beginning and no end. Why so—without beginning? For there is time too little To begin it from beginning. Why then without end? For I am sorry for the lad. From the bitter year's first days, From our native land's dark hour We became friends with you, for good, Vasily Tyorkin, you and I.

²¹M. Alger. Boitzu (To a Fighter); Pamyati khrabrykh (In Memory of the Brave), 1941.

To forget I have no right
To what you owe your glory,
How and where you helped me out.
Time there is for work and time for fun,
In the war you can't do without my Tyorkin.
How can I abandon him?
Of old friendship ties are strong.
In the middle let's begin the book.
Somehow it will go. . .
. . . The same grim road he takes
Like two hundred years ago
He went armed with a firelock,
Russia's hard worker—Russian soldier. . .

And Vasily Tyorkin, on the wings of his gay byword, with the help of unassuming courage, survives all possible dangers. When his friends and commanders give him up as lost—he always reappears even if he has to swim across a frozen river naked. Death cannot touch him. He is so much alive that his fellow-soldiers, lending a hand to his inventor, make him immortal. Vasily Tyorkin is about life, in no matter what insufferable conditions—it is still life. But the poet has also attempted to record the unrecordable, to tell with words that which as yet was untold in art, which could not be told in art: the horror and the madness of mass-murder. Such an attempt, which remains unforgettable to those who read it in Russian, is Ilya Selvinsky's "I saw it myself." Unforgettable is its directness, its simplicity. Here are parts of the poem that can only approximate the original:

One doesn't have to listen to folk tales,
One doesn't have to believe news columns.
But I saw it myself. With my own eyes.
Do you understand it? I saw it. Myself.
Here is the road. And here is the hill.
Between them—a ditch.
Out of this ditch arises sorrow,
Sorrow without shores.
No. About this you can not tell with words.
Here you must shout. Weep.
Seven thousand shot in a ditch,
Rusty, like ore.

Who are these people? Fighters? No. Guerillas, maybe? Not at all. Here lies lop-eared Kol'ka—He is eleven.
All his relatives next to him.

. . . Beloved ones. . . Terrible ones. . . Like for a housewarming

Their corpses populate the ditch.
They lie. They sit. They glide down.
Each has a gesture. Amazingly his.
Winter froze on each corpse the expression
With which he took death, alive.
And corpses rave, threaten, hate. . .
The dead silence yells like a mass meeting.
. . . Close by—a Jewess.

... Close by—a Jewess.

She has a child. He seems asleep.

With what care the child's neck is tied

With mother's grey scarf.

O, the ancient motherly power.

On the way to be shot, on the way to her bullet.

On the way to be shot, on the way to her bullet, An hour, a half an hour before her grave— The mother protected her child from catching cold. But even death does not make them part. The enemy has no power over them.

And a few reddish drops from the child's ear Run into the cup of his mother's hands.

How it hurts to write about it.

How frightful.

18

rs

ot

ut

ut

th

ld

t-

n,

t-

p-

But you must. You must. Write. . . You must thunder like Dante, like Ovid If you saw it all yourself—

And did not go mad.

But silent I stand over the dreary grave.

What are words? Words decayed.

Once upon a time—I wrote about my beloved,

About kissing, nightingales. . . It seemed, what was there to such a theme.

True? However,

Try and find the right word Even for such a simple thing.

But here? Here nerves are like bows.

And strings—like dried spinal cords.

No—for such monstrous pain
A language is yet not created. . .

This ditch. . . Can you talk about it in a poem?

Seven thousand corpses. . . Jews. . . Slavs. . .

Yes. But not with words.

With fire. Only with fire.

Reading this poem by the leader of the once very important school of constructivism, one could say that he matured, that he threw overboard his passion for trickery, that he abandoned the search for effective metaphors, but, not losing the sharpness of the concrete detail, he learned how to make a choice. He learned how to say more with less. But all this seems irrelevant. Through this poem we sense that a revaluation of values takes place again. "What are words? words decayed . . . for such a monstrous pain a language is yet not created." Did words decay? Did they turn to ashes? Will new words be born out of agony? Are they born already to render immortal the suffering of millions?

Atl

par

wit

in his

firs

ten

his

and litt me bot less a fe

Find Amore Russ

In us there is a grim freedom: Dooming a mother to tears, To buy immortality of a people With our own death.²²

²²K. Simonov. Slava (Glory), Iz frontovogo bloknota (Out of the Front Notebook), 1943.

Balakirev*

By M. O. ZETLIN

(Translated by Olga Oushakoff)

In him was all-powerful magic, An incomprehensible might.
—Lermontov

T.

ool erefde-

ore

nse

ds?

yet

ew

m-

Note

MILY ALEKSEEVICH BALAKIREV was not quite eighteen when he met Glinka. In age he was almost a "Wunderkind," but in appearance and manner he was a real "Wundermensch"—not a wonder child or even youth, but a wonder-man. Just as Athene, in ancient legend, sprang from the head of Zeus in full panoply, helmeted and spear in hand, so was he, it might seem, born with a pencil, marking a musical score and with a conductor's baton in his hand. He looked all of thirty: a full beard framed his face, his features were handsome though somewhat rough-hewn, and at first nothing in him betrayed either the refinement or the nervous temperament of an artist. Only at times would a sparkle appear in his eyes and a note of restrained emotion sound in his voice.

Perhaps unconsciously, wishing to heighten this impression of sudden manhood and maturity, he avoided speaking of his past years and of his not so far distant childhood. Even those close to him knew little about him. They knew that he was the son of a minor government official in Nizhny-Novgorod, that his father and mother were both musical, that his mother, who died young, had given him piano lessons. They knew also that when he was ten years old he had taken a few lessons from one of the pupils of the famous Field, with whom he played Hummel's B minor concerto, the same that Glinka had

*We are printing, in a slightly abridged form, the English version of one chapter from M. Zetlin's book *The Five and Others*, recently published in Russian. The "Five" of the book are Balakirev, Borodin, Cui, Musorgsky, and Rimsky-Korsakov. Among the "others," the most prominent part is played by V. V. Stasov, a well-known art critic, and the principal champion of the national school of music in Russia [Ed.].

of

can

of

thi

the

wh

of

in

the

frie

the

WO

this

om

the

was

fro

was

for

ing

alre

in t

hus

city

anc

afla

He

imp

He

whi

mo

Mi

whe

on

clas

Mil

Wh

once played for the author. He had studied at the Kazan University in the department of mathematics but had not completed the course. His real school had been the home of the music lover Ulybyshev in Nizhny-Novgorod, the gathering place of all local music lovers. Here a musical atmosphere reigned. Ulybyshev had a very adequate musical library and every Thursday and Saturday the orchestra of the local theater played at his house. Here in the little parlor Balakirev had endless talks on music with Ulybyshev which lasted far into the night. Ulybyshev entrusted to Balakirev the training of this orchestra, which numbered about twenty musicians, and which, with more or less skill, played classical music, including all the symphonies of Beethoven except the Ninth. (The patron was studying these for a work directed against the great German that he was preparing). Just before Balakirev left for Petersburg he also conducted this orchestra.

If Stasov had not known all this about Balakirev he would have had to consider the latter's knowledge a work of magic. But even knowing this background he was amazed. In his compositions and improvisation Balakirev showed a complete mastery of harmony and counterpoint. His knowledge of instrumentation was striking. His musical memory bordered on the miraculous. He never forgot anything that had been played to him even once, and knew practically all the classics by heart. And to this was added an idealism, a devotion to art that Stasov had never before encountered. Such a man by rights could expect an open road to European fame. Of him, as of Napoleon, one wanted to say: Il sait tout, veut tout, peut tout. (He knows all, wants all, can do all). He played the piano as well as Anton Rubinstein, without the brilliant technique of the latter, but with more depth and penetration. Apart from his orchestral knowledge, it seemed that the powerful magnetism of his personality gave promise of his becoming a great conductor, a new Berlioz. All his judgments were well based, authoritative.

Although Stasov was fourteen years his senior, he rather looked up to Balakirev as to a superior. Just as Mily was far beyond his age in maturity so, on the other hand, did Stasov remain all his life a grown-up child—kind-hearted but always trying to pose as an enfant terrible. There was something childlike even in the way he wore his clothes. His quick temper with its short-lived anger was

also that of a child.

The two men quickly became closely and deeply attached to each other. It was a man's friendship and one which meant much to both

of them. This friendship, which continued and intensified, never became commonplace, as so often happens, not only because the prose of existence played but a small part in their lives, but also because this inescapable prose, consciously or unconsciously, was left out of the field of their intercourse. Their friendship was on a higher plane, where the trivialities of life were absent and only the wider interests of art and spirit remained. A certain formality was always present in their relations—even in speaking to each other they never used the familiar "thou" so usual among close friends in Russia.

"Bach, dear Bachinka," was what Balakirev called his older friend, because of the latter's love for the great poliphonist. And on the lips of Balakirev this nick-name sounded as softly as a solo on wood instruments and was spoken with all the tenderness of which

this nervous, always vibrating man was capable.

S.

of

1-

11

15

h

1-

se

r-

ed

ve

en

nd

nd

Iis

y-

ly

0-

by

of

ut.

ell

er,

ral

ity

All

ced

his

ife

en-

he

was

ach

oth

From the first day they met, Stasov called his friend "Mily," omitting the usual patronimic, and continued to call him so when they became friends. All in all, Balakirev's part in this friendship was the more active and affectionate. He lived a secluded life, apart from the flurry of cares and interests that surrounded Stasov. He was poor, gave lessons, was getting ready for struggle, for fame, for action, with the seriousness and concentration of a novice preparing to take the vows. And were not poverty, continence, celibacy, already a part of his life? Did not this life he lived in his small room in the apartment of the Russianized German Sophie Ediet and her husband resemble that of a convent cell? In the cold and indifferent city to have the friendship of the noisy Stasov, who believed in him and valued him, meant a great deal to Balakirev.

With his fiery, almost Italian temperament, Stasov was always aflame with enthusiasm over something or even over nothing at all. He liked Balakirev not only as a man, but as a great hope, as a living impersonation of his own dreams for the future of national music. He loved his unyielding idealism, his open and brave truthfulness, which was akin to his own nature. But Stasov was healthier in spirit,

more superficial, and more care-free than his friend.

They made much music together and at the piano, of course, Mily took the leading rôle. It was he who interpreted the music when they played duets, at times throwing new and unexpected light on long familiar passages. Stasov had a better knowledge of the classics, of the old Italian composers, and of ancient church music. Mily had the narrowness peculiar to the creative temperament. While not refuting the classics he was comparatively indifferent to

them. He believed that the great treasures of classical music were the foundations on which to build, but into which one should not needlessly delve. The classics were something well-known, to be taken for granted, and Balakirev was searching for new paths. But he never ceased to delight in the magnificent mystical rhetoric of Liszt, the ironical light and shadow of Schumann's lyrics, the dazzling colorfulness of Berlioz's orchestra. He liked Chopin, though he valued him less highly. They both despised the bourgeois Mendelssohn (though Stasov without much conviction), and could not stand the pompous self-advertiser Wagner.

Just as in music Stasov followed the leadership of his younger friend, so in everything "intellectual" it was Stasov who led. They liked to read aloud. It was usually Stasov who read and he did it well. He could read for hours and Balakirev listen. Mily would pace the room, sit down, lie on the couch and Stasov would never pause. Sometimes, absorbed in the reading, the friends would forget to trim the oil lamp which would begin to smoke. Black soot would fill the room, fall on the pages of the book, get into their nostrils, throats. The friends would begin to sneeze and cough. The landlady would

have to be called and the windows opened.

II.

This period, the beginning of the sixties of the last century, was a peculiar one. After the loss of the Crimean campaign, the new reign was setting out on a course of reforms. Renovation in every field was taking place more rapidly than in the times of Peter the Great Reform followed reform, and they came from above and without revolution. A wave of optimism was sweeping the country. Among the cultured classes, the intelligentsia, that spiritual movement was preparing which was soon to engulf Russia for half a century. This movement had not yet become known as "populism" (narodnichestvo), but it was the latter's preparatory stage. It was a peculiar religion in atheist array, a socialist and humanitarian one, giving to drink of its waters (not always life-giving) to the further removed fields of literature, art, and music. Faith in the common people and in the higher truth and good inherent in them, the urge to serve the people, to join with them as one, to atone for the sins committed against them—were the most salient features of the populist trend

Stasov did not fully share these ideas but he was close to them Balakirev, however, was much less in sympathy with this move-

m

W

is

to

so

ot

m

m

fre

fea

the

an

501

ide

Ne

rea

lat

SCT

sor fol

led

Ho

kir

Sta

Wa:

pro

este

On

hac

this

inn

W

duc

Rus

all

atio

reas

ment. His roots, probably of a bourgeois or ecclesiastical nature, were deeply embedded in the old Russia which had long ago vanished. It was only reluctantly that he yielded to the cosmopolitan tolerance of Stasov. He intuitively disliked all foreigners. For Stasov there truly existed neither Jew nor Gentile. Balakirev, on the other hand, bore in his heart the seeds of a reactionary chauvinism—he equally disliked the Germans, the Jews, and the Poles. It meant something that he came from Nizhny-Novgorod, where memory still lived of the plain townsman who had saved Russia from the Poles. Besides, he had in him an artistic individualism, a fear of the masses and a dislike for them—all emotions contrary to those of populism. He was a romantic reactionary, a misanthrope, and an individualist. He too, however, under the influence of Stasov and the entire spiritual atmosphere of the times, absorbed many ideas, emotions, and prejudices of the intelligentsia.

What did they not read! Homer and Shakespeare, Gogol and Nekrasov, books on natural science, which at that time were required reading for the intelligentsia, Belinsky, and Chernyshevsky. The latter's rather primitive novel What to do? had, due to some inscrutable fate, an especially great influence on Balakirev. Evidently some active force emanated at that time from these simple pages and, following the mysterious laws of transformation of spiritual energy, led Balakirev to the idea of an opera and, as he put it, brought to his mind a "clear understanding" of how operas should be written! How this would have amazed the famous socialist! However, Bala-

kirev never did compose this opera.

re

ot

be

ut

of a

2-

gh

n-

ot

ger

ley

it

ace

ise.

im

the

ats.

uld

as a

eign

ield

eat.

nout

ong

Was

This

rich-

r re-

g to

oved

and

e the

itted

end

hem

ove-

Neither of the friends was of exceptional intellectual refinement. Stasov was more experienced and better educated, but Balakirev was cleverer by nature, more spontaneous and self-willed. He approached the few intellectual problems (outside music) which interested him in his own way and without following accepted standards. One question really disturbed him—the one for which "populism" had so idealistic and optimistic an answer. He wanted to know what this Russian people really was that he loved intuitively, with his inner being, without a second thought, as one loves one's family. What is this people from which miracles are expected, which produced Glinka, and which is to create that heretofore unheard of Russian school of music? The people that Nekrasov and Belinsky, all and everyone, newspapers and magazines, lectures and proclamations, taught one to love. But why should it be loved? For many reasons. Because it suffers and has suffered, because fate has passed

5

1

r

q

V

b

n

n

p

tl

W

0

b

e

h

b

n

n

a

e

it by, because of the enormous force lying buried in it. Because it loves God and mocks at priests, prays to ikons and despises them. Because it carries in itself the great truth, has preserved the ideals of meekness and resignation. Because it is an inherent rebel, ready to resurrect the days of Pugachev. Because it has retained the forms of communal life and is more ingenious than the Americans. In a word, because of a thousand contrary traits and virtues, because of all the elusive mystery which everyone can sense in that bright, flickering, iridescent word "the people." But Balakirev, like Thomas who doubted, wished to place his own hand in the wounds, to convince himself of everything. And together with his friend, he avidly peered, listened, and read to learn for himself what the Russian people, his people, really represented.

III.

Sometimes Stasov would be detained: a headache (he worried about his health as do so many healthy people), some rush work for the Public Library, or friends coming to see him would detain him at his home. Then Mily would feel lonesome without "the dear features" of his "precious Bachinka" and would begin to worry. It is true that he had a photograph of his friend at which he loved to gaze and which even inspired him to "write better," but this was not enough. "I want to see you like a pregnant woman wants a green apple; let me see your uncouth face." And in order to see his friend, in spite of his dislike of travel, he would leave his room, and if it were inconvenient to talk in the official rooms of the Public Library he would go to the nearby restaurant where Stasov usually dined. Here waiters rushed back and forth in coats supposedly white, a noisy machine rattled out the "Miserere" from Il Trovatore, and here, shouting to overcome the din and the clatter of dishes, the friends could talk of everything that had accumulated during the few days they had not seen each other. "How glad I am to again kiss your Des-dur cheeks, your uncouth face, to embrace your absurd figure" would say Mily. "Des-dur" (D flat major) with Mily was a term of endearment, as he loved that tonality, and the word "absurd," as he said it, contained an abyss of tenderness. Stasov's figure was far from being absurd—he was tall and well

They lived rather far from each other. Cabs were not expensive, but they crawled, and in bad weather the trip was not a pleasure.

Sometimes, therefore, in place of the usual meeting the friends wrote to each other. But if one of them was sick, or imagined himself so, and this happened often, the other always came to see him. If only Stasov happened to have a slight fever he stayed awake all night, expecting to be told next morning that he was down with the typhus. Balakirev, on the other hand, was always complaining of the doctors. "My health does not improve, because my doctor, like all the rest of them, is an ass in medicine and assures me that I am quite well." Luckily for him, he could remain in bed even without an "ass of a doctor" and call for consolation and entertainment upon "the nicest of human beings, the dearest Bachinka." Without him it was lonely and dull "to be sick." When "Bach" came in, the whole rather small apartment of the Ediets would resound with his loud basso, his noisy indignation, boisterous cheerfulness, and political news. When he finally calmed down, the friends would play duets on the piano or Stasov would read aloud. Mily had a fine Becker piano, bought on credit, which was being slowly paid for in instalments out of money he earned by giving piano lessons (alas, he had perforce to don the yoke of music teacher, though he did this with the impatience of an Arab thoroughbred).

S

f

ıs

1-

y

n

ed or

m

ar It

to

as

a

118

m,

b-

ully

ra-

of

ed

ice

nd

ess.

ve,

re.

Balakirev composed much during these years and the faith his friend had in him was a great stimulus. When he arranged Glinka's "Night Parade" for orchestra and presented it to Stasov the latter was delighted. He thanked Mily again and again, told him that no one in the world could be more grateful than he was for the gift, but that even the wish to please him, which the gift showed, was enough to arouse all the good existing in his nature. "Whenever I happen to hear the 'Night Parade' I await the mysterious mystical beat that is the opening of the grave; then suddenly, a magic atmosphere is created and Napoleon himself appears." "Glinka was a master in creating such magical atmosphere," said Stasov, and then added: "But I know some one else who, it seems, will some time also produce like miracles."

IV.

And Mily did achieve such miracles—under his friend's very eyes and not without his participation. Stasov was constantly searching for topics and subjects for Mily's music. It was he who first suggested the legend of "Sadko" for a symphonic poem, but this was not a success. It was also due to his insistence that Mily wrote

music to Shakespeare's "King Lear." They read the play together, and Mily declared that he could see a resemblance between Shakespeare's king and Stasov. "You have the same straightforward, elevated and wild virginal nature" were his words. For "Lear" Stasov unearthed and copied old English melodies, known to few at that time even in England. He greeted with enthusiasm every new fragment of this music that Mily produced. But how slow these were to appear! The Overture, four Intermissions, the March, and several short interludes were stretched out over a period of two and a half years. Mily constantly complained that "Lear was silent." "I always work slowly. Remember that I began to think about and to write the Russian overture in November '57 and finished it only in June. Of course it was incomparably easier to write than the music for 'Lear,' because there I was my own master, while here I must subordinate myself to Shakespeare and perform a difficult task at the same time."

Stasov wanted to have this music presented at the performance of the Aleksandrinsky Theater, but they wanted only the Overture and this Mily would not hear of. When "Lear" was completed, Mily, like Pushkin, missed his long labor, "his silent companion of the night," but at the same time he was glad it was ended. Work did not come easily to him and meant a great strain. "Somehow my head feels weak, my brain is aflame, my feet are cold as ice, a kind of nervous shivering overcomes me. Yesterday I thought so hard (composing the March) that I believed I was going mad." How clearly these words stress the fact that musical creative work is also an effort of the brain, that it makes demands on the whole of an individ-

ual. This, at any rate, was the case with Balakirev.

But work and effort were not wasted. "Lear," and especially the Overture and the March, succeeded splendidly. Together with Mendelssohn's "Midsummer Night's Dream" it was probably the best music inspired by Shakespeare. With what heart-tremors did Stasov listen for the first time, not on the piano but at the University Concert, to these brass fanfares, these rumbling drums, to the Shakespearean majesty of this music, so strictly classical in form.

F

t

n

F

fı

ir

Ca

CC

How proud he was that it was dedicated to him!

It was during these years of friendship with Stasov that Balakirev wrote his three overtures—one each on Russian and Czech themes and one composed on the occasion of Russia's millenary celebration, and which he later named "Rus" (Russia). Into these he also put all of himself, all he thought and felt at the time of their composition. Thus, in "A Thousand Years" the three major themes were

to personify the basic elements of Russian history. This was to be, as he expressed it, its "instrumental drama." He did not himself create the themes for his overtures, but, like Glinka, took ready-made melodies from folk songs he happened to find to his liking. But although the influence of Glinka and Berlioz could be felt, Balakirev's work remained original and his own. He, better than any one else, knew how to fuse borrowed melodies in his melting pot and make them the starting point of his own, unquestionably Balakirev's work, developing them with such fire and glitter that it became quite unimportant whether these themes had been originally his own or not.

The fact that he himself did not lack melodical talent is proved by the charming songs he wrote during these same years. Strangely enough it was an extraneous circumstance that led to their appearance—a certain publisher, Denotkin, contrary to the custom of the

times, offered to pay a modest honorarium for them.

e

f

e

i,

d

d

10

th

ne

id

r-

ne

n.

ev

es

n,

ut

Si-

re

During these same years Balakirev composed a piano concert and a "Fantasy on Oriental Themes," which he later renamed "Islamey." In this Fantasy, as happened in Balakirev's work, the original freshness of inspiration was weakened later by too much elaboration, which resulted in the piece being "overdone." At the same time he began a symphonic poem on the theme of Lermontov's "Queen Tamara," which eventually became one of his best known works. Lermontov inspired him. He was his favorite poet, the one for whom he felt a "selective sympathy." Balakirev realized that Pushkin was more mature and more finished, but Lermontov attracted him by the inherent magnetism of a strong nature. "If Lermontov had lived forty years, he would have become our first poet and one of the first in the world," Balakirev used to say.

But Balakirev could not be satisfied with only creative work, which even then did not flow from him in strong uninterrupted stream. He longed for action and to influence others. Friendship with Stasov, who was not a musician, had ceased to satisfy him—he needed followers and disciples. These soon gathered round him. For them he was Tsar and God, they hung on every word that fell

from his lips and swore by their teacher.

The most promising among them was a youth of seventeen, still in high school, Apollon Gusakovsky. Both Balakirev and Stasov came to love him for his talents, his friendly and happy nature, his kindly laughter, and his Bohemian recklessness. With his swarthy complexion and slanting bright eyes he looked more like some kind

b

F

0

th

th

H

U

W

in

ti

ar

de

W

bu

an

ad

SO

ar

in

hi

Ba

de

of

ga

m

to

ev

ser

it.

L

Wa

Wa

COI

Lo

she

0'0

cor

mu

A

of Malayan than a Russian. Gusakovsky was one of those gifted amateurs who may often be found associating with creative artists but who, while appearing their equals to the superficial observer, cannot withstand the trials of life, fall behind, and always remain congenial but good-for-nothing Bohemians. Besides, Gusakovsky lived in great poverty and was also handicapped by a too wide range of interests. He was not only a musician but did serious work in chemistry and geology. He improvised brilliantly, planned to write music for "Faust," tried to compose a symphony-all this gave great promise but came to nothing. He was lively, talked a great deal, could not sit still a minute. Always in a hurry, he never finished one thing before turning to another. He often went hungry, gave poorly paid lessons, for which he did not always collect, but never lost heart and, cheerful and noisy, would come rushing into the Library to see Stasov and at once, remembering some more important business, would rush out again. Stasov had good reason to fear that in music, as in everything else, Gusakovsky with his "mercurial tempera-

ment" would always remain "half-baked."

About the same time that he came to know Gusakovsky, Balakirev first met a young officer named Musorgsky. This meeting took place in the salon of Dargomyzhsky, where all kinds of "musical people" congregated at "that old witch Alexander Dargomyzhsky's" as Balakirev put it. Musorgsky played the piano very spiritedly, made attempts to compose. He asked Balakirev to give him lessons in theory and composition, but was rather dumb and very obstinate. But then how quick at catching ideas, how refined, talented, clever and sharp-witted was their third friend, the young army engineer Caesar Antonovich Cui. He likewise did not devote much time to music, but had received some training from the Polish composer Moniuszko. Cui was of French origin with an admixture of Polish blood through his mother. He was writing an opera on the subject of Pushkin's "The Caucasian Captive," had composed several good songs. His attitude towards Balakirev was respectful, but he had a sarcastic smile and an ironical glint in the sharp small eyes which looked out from under his glasses. His comments were bitter, but he showered Balakirev with compliments and stressed the community of their ideas and aspirations.

Somewhat later they met a professor of chemistry, Borodin. Tall, handsome, with wonderful Oriental eyes, he carried with him wherever he went a spirit of cheerfulness and kindness, strength and talent. He had a composer's talent peculiar to himself, but was too

busy to give much time to music.

Thus, gradually a circle of musicians formed around Balakirev. For these young men, of whom Cui and Borodin were his seniors (Borodin by two whole years), Balakirev was "the master." He was the only professional among these "amateurs" and overwhelmed them with his knowledge, talent, authority, soundness of judgment. His word was law. Only Cui talked with him almost as an equal. Under his guidance they tried to compose. He looked over their work, summarily changing tonalities (he had a definite prejudice in favor of some tonalities and an aversion to others), adding entire passages and reshaping everything according to his own taste and fancy. He was a born despot, and this despotism was further developed by the attitude of those around him. But his despotism was disinterested and he could truthfully say "not for us the glory, but to Thy Name." He lived "in the name" of art, music, Russia,

and wanted nothing for himself.

n

r

r

0

r

h

ct

d

h

ut

n-

11,

T-

ul-

00

But soon Balakirev began to feel stifled in this narrow circle of admirers. He longed for a wider field of activity and especially for some way of using his knowledge of orchestra and the conductor's art. He was supported in the desire by Stasov and those surrounding him, although Stasov himself had no faith in the strength of his aspirations. With the perspicacity of one who loves, he felt that Balakirev was not a man of deeds but rather one who dreams of deeds. But deeds were forthcoming in those years. A good friend of Glinka, Lomakin, whom Stasov also knew well, decided to organize a Free School of Music. This school was to give the wide masses of the people an opportunity to study music. Instruction was to be free of charge, and the hours were to be so arranged, in the evenings and on holidays, that all working people-laborers and servants, the seemstress and the maid—could avail themselves of it. This idea was in complete accord with the spirit of the times. . . Lomakin himself took charge of the vocal instruction. Balakirev was to direct the orchestral class. The frail structure of the school was to be based on the receipts from future concerts. For the first concert Count Sheremetev gave permission for his choir, of which Lomakin had been for many years a successful director, to give a short recital. The concert took place on March 11, 1862, at one o'clock in the afternoon, with Karl Schubert conducting. After the concert, Lomakin gave a dinner at which speeches were made and much wine drunk. The Free School of Music had become a reality. A week later the second concert took place, and in the autumn Balakirev became the conductor and director of the School program. Thus Balakirev's life crystallized: meetings with Stasov, duets on the piano, improvisations, a few lessons to keep body and soul together, a few friends who shared his aspirations, plodding work on his compositions, concerts at the Free School. What else was there? Very little. Outwardly his life was poverty-ridden and uneventful. Its monotony was broken from time to time by trips to his birthplace Nizhny-Novgorod, to the Caucasus for a cure, or to Moscow. The sight of the Kremlin, the Red Square, the cathedrals, the view across the Moscow River, and all the beauties and antiquities of Moscow awoke Mily's patriotism (which had always slept but lightly and was not difficult to arouse) and his pride in being a Russian. He was certain that he had expressed in his works "a particle of the Kremlin" and even, to be more exact, the Kremlin towers. He felt the urge to compose a symphony in honor of the Kremlin.

In his several trips to Nizhny-Novgorod, Balakirev saw his old and most annoying father. His younger sisters were growing up and there was no money for their education. Mily succeeded in placing one of them in the Institute for Girls on a state scholarship. But to do this he had to plead, pay calls on the Governor's wife, play the piano at a party given by the Directress of the Institute. All r

0

p

tl

y

m

he

ca

hi

lil

m

Sy

Ba

ma

ter

wh

wh

the

he

to

ers

WO

the

this was difficult for him and disgusted him.

He had the opportunity to go to the Caucasus and to take the cure at Piatigorsk and Zheleznovodsk. Perhaps it was the Tatar blood flowing in his veins that spoke, perhaps the majestic beauty of the Caucasian landscape that capitvated him, but he, like Lermontov before him, was overwhelmed and carried away by the Caucasus—its mountains, its natives, and their customs. Even the Cherkess dress impressed him as the best imaginable, and, again like Lermontov, he bought himself a Cherkess costume and wore it with childlike pleasure, not omitting to send a picture of himself so dressed to his friend "Bach." Enjoying the beautiful scenery surrounding Piatigorsk, Balakirev read and re-read Lermontov's verses, read his A Hero of Our Times and "breathed and lived in the Poet."

Except for these brief interludes, Balakirev lived in Petersburg. From time to time he would be invited to visit Glinka's sister, Liudmila Ivanovna, at her summer home. Here, living with the family, he would rest and amuse himself by playing and singing with her daughter, and Glinka's niece, Olechka. Occasionally, though not

very often, he visited Stasov at the latter's summer cottage in a suburb of Petersburg—Pargolovo. What else was there? There was poverty, creative work, there were day dreams and dreams at night, vivid and clear. These dreams were not, as they are with most people, distorted fragments of reality. After all, reality for Balakirev was nothing but sublime transports, dreams, idealism, a life in the world of sounds created by himself or by others, only sublime romance far removed from real life, only a life of the spirit. And his dreams were of music and musicians, of notes and tonalities, dreams of dreams. Sometimes these dreams were so vivid that he woke in the morning not rested and without strength for anything.

n

-

of

d

p

in

p.

e,

11

he

ar

ity

er-

he

he

ke

ith

SO

ur-

ses,

the

irg.

ud-

ily,

her

not

Thus once he dreamt of Schumann. He could not afterwards remember his face, all he remembered was that it was a pleasant one. He asked Schumann whether he spoke French, and the composer answered "yes" with a friendly nod. He then addressed him with a hymn of praise in that language, beginning something like this: Vous voyez devant vous un musicien russe qui est votre grand adorateur (You see before you a Russian musician who worships you). Schumann answered something pleasant. Balakirev was going to question him in detail about the form of the finale to his C major symphony, but Schumann disappeared ("Were it not a dream he would not have got away from me!"). Then, somewhere, he caught up with him again ("Of course I did"), and Schumann gave him his calling card, but a very crumpled one. Mily would have liked to get an autograph but this he was unable to do. Then he remembered that he wanted to find out about the finale to the C major symphony but Schumann again disappeared, this time for good, and Balakirev awoke.

Afterwards, for a long time, his nerves vibrated, and he remained thrilled with joy at this dream meeting. But his joy was tempered by annoyance that he had not succeeded in finding out why Schumann had departed from the classical form in his finale, why he had not kept to the form of the rondo or the sonata.

There was one thing that few noticed, but that Stasov felt with the perspicacity of love. Under the show of strength in Balakirev, he suspected some sort of inner weakness. In the presence of others, to the world at large, he continued to insist on the exceptional powers of his friend. "Balakirev flies like an eagle in front of all," he would affirm. It seemed as though his nature was of the quality of the most highly tempered steel, of a diamond of the purest water

—that nothing could bend or break his will. Yet somewhere there was a crack in the steel, somewhere a flaw in the diamond, and Stasov's intuition told him that some day this man would break down. Balakirev had traits of extreme, unmanly nervousnessneurasthenia. He was superstitious and timid to the highest degree. Once, when still young and carefree, Balakirev was on his way to Moscow in company with a gay young friend. At one of the stations they were offered better accommodation in another car of the train and, after having transferred their belongings, Balakirev missed his cane. Nobody could have stolen it, he decided, therefore its disappearance must be supernatural and would lead to other losses and disappointments. He was so upset by this thought that for the rest of the journey he remained in his seat and refused to get out at stations for a "bite" and a "drink" as had been the custom of the two friends. When he was away from Petersburg, his mind always worked the same way-he would never again see those whom he needed most in life, his dear friend "Bach," his "dear nurse," his landlady, Mrs. Ediet. If he had no letters from them for any length of time he was convinced that they had died. And if a letter came from Mrs. Ediet's husband, he was certain that it was to prepare him for the terrible news of her death, as it was known that he could never stand such a blow without some preparation. "Take care of yourself, if only for my sake. If you die what will become of me?" he would say to Stasov. Stasov would answer that he also could not visualize life without Mily, just as without his little daughter Sophie; but very likely this answer was only given out of politeness and not to let his friend down. In a word, if Mily felt depressed, if he was unwell or unhappy—things were bad. But if everything was going well—things were even worse, as a calm could only mean that a storm was coming, it could only mean some new and unexpected blow of fate.

Moreover, he became a misanthrope; not, as it sometimes happens, due to any disillusionment in people or from some blow of fate, but so to say in advance, as though calling for some such blow. If it can be said that fate lies in the character of a man which predetermines and calls forth external events, then truly Balakirev's character, with its inclination to dark forebodings, to hypochondria, misanthropy, foretold an unusual and hard life. He was only twenty-six years old, still quite a young man, when he made the following confession to Stasov, a confession which would have sounded much more natural coming from the lips of the old man

rest son I at real but dan sion mal ciet

Sch

It is the alw inti-

full

was

Raz

mattand that how far best

Wro

"Co old, the bloo inju the iful,

gasp it w to st

even

Y

Schopenhauer: "I do not consider myself or you as people if the rest are called people. I have lived with them and am compelled to some extent to live with them now, and I find that among people I am like a dog among hens. Inwardly, I renounced people and then realized that society was necessary as a source of lifegiving sap, but could not find it. This was frightfully irritating and extremely damaging to my whole work. . . This is why I feel such an aversion to perform in public; my fingers become paralyzed when you make me play Lear or something else to which, after all, our society is indifferent. To play in public or to conduct an orchestra is such an effort for me that it cannot but be harmful to my nature. It is always terrible to me to realize that, having written something, there is no way of hearing one's composition except at a concert—it always seems something like telling a police agent of one's most intimate emotions. . . I have finished with people and only go to them sometimes because it is necessary to eat and drink."

Stasov supported him in these ideas; it seemed that he was in full accord with his friend. He was even preparing a book which was to be entitled in French—Le Carnage Général and in Russian Razgrom, which he considered was to be his capital and foremost work, his "Ninth Symphony." He was to prove in it that it was natural for the public, the wide masses, to have bad taste always and in everything, and to approve only of those works and artists that were not endowed with eternal and true values. In his heart, however, Stasov liked people, his soul was open to them. He was far from being a misanthrope, rather was he a philanthropist in the

best sense of the word.

Stasov, kind and believing in his friend, was right—but was also wrong—when he once wrote to Balakirev during the latter's illness: "Come back and you will be mended here not like one mends an old, toothless nag for whom the Tatars are already watching for the slaughterhouse, but as one mends a young, impatient, pure-blooded Arab stallion, full of fire and spirits, who has temporarily injured its leg, worth thousands, stumbling over a cobblestone in the road, but who will at any moment gallop away, free and beautiful, with spreading tail and mane and flaming nostrils, leaving everyone gasping at the sight."

Yes, the steed was thoroughbred, priceless, and one could only gasp at its sight. Stasov himself continually gasped in wonder. But it was not a single cobblestone that was the cause of its beginning to stumble so early in life, nor the fact that life had harnessed it to

a heavy load. No, the steed was too fiery, too nervous and untrained, and life, like an unskilled jockey, was to break its back in its first steeple-chase, the hurdles of which it was not capable, alas, of clearing systematically and skilfully.

ar ar th

fr

or

fo ur wl Sl be

Sl

be

W

The Teaching of Russian in the United States

By ARTHUR PRUDDEN COLEMAN

offer Russian instruction?" I remarked to a colleague in the History Department the other day.

I had been going through my files in preparation for this article and was enthusiastic over the expansion of Slavic studies in general and Russian in particular during the past four or five years. "More than seventy," was the answer I was waiting for a chance to give my own question, "and that's a lot."

But my enthusiasm was to suffer a severe chilling.

"A good many more, I daresay, than will be offering it ten years

from now!" came the brisk retort.

A prediction as spontaneous and

A prediction as spontaneous and self-assured as that, coming from one who is a key figure in the so-called Area Studies that have been one of the phenomena of the war years and who will have a profound influence on the historical research to be undertaken in our universities after the war, could not be laughed off. I wondered whether he was right. Will the present interest in Russian and other Slavic languages and cultures, widespread and intense as it seems to be today, disappear with the war's ending, leaving us with but a memory of a brief "field day"?

The shadow of this possibility hangs over all of us engaged in

Slavic teaching.

And yet my colleague may be wrong. There is always the chance that trade may take up where war leaves off, and save the present expansion of Slavic studies from having to be written off as a mere war boom. Evidence is abundant to support the belief that because of trade Americans will continue to reach out, and in increasing numbers, toward a surer and more precise knowledge of the Slavic, especially of the Russian, world. It was through trade, we must not forget, that Russia first became acquainted with and interested in the

Si

n

d

0

2

st

W

m

R

in

V

Va

li

te

br

da

ki

th

al

th

to

en

va

20

sp

th

sp

on

T

SIC

no

to

un

for

M

in

No

as

English-speaking world. We read in a quaint old volume from 1641, The Treasure of Traffike, or A Discourse of Forraigne Trade, by Lewes Roberts, "How had ever the name of the English beene knowne in . . . Moscovia . . . had not the Traffike of our Nation discovered and spread abroad the fame of their Soveraigne Potency and the renowne of that peoples valour and worth?" Perhaps it will now work the other way, and because of the interest awakened by trade we shall be induced at last to establish Russian studies soundly and soberly and permanently, as all who are teachers in the field earnestly desire.

The study of Russian by individuals began more than a hundred years ago in this country, when numerous isolated persons, by hard and lonely toil, for amusement and self-improvement, managed to achieve at least a partial mastery of Russian. Judge John Pickering of Boston, James Gates Percival of New Haven, and even one of our Presidents, John Quincy Adams, were among those early stu-

dents.

Formal instruction in Russian arrived only in the second half of the 19th century, at Harvard first, where it developed slowly under Professor Leo Wiener. Up to 1914, when Slavic studies enjoyed their first boom in our country, thanks to the First World War, regular and competent instruction in Russian was offered at only five universities. This is two more than the three mentioned by Professor Samuel H. Cross in a recent article in the Slavonic and East European Review (August, 1944), since, besides Harvard and Columbia and California, which are the three he probably means, there was also Yale, which from early in the century had offered instruction under Max Solomon Mandell, who was my own teacher; and there was Chicago, with the late Samuel Harper in charge.

Up to 1939, whatever progress Russian studies made in the United States was due entirely to the vision of the graduate schools of the great universities, with Harvard and California, Columbia and Chicago taking the lead. Since the war Cornell has had to be joined to the list of pacemakers in this field. Graduate work in Russian is now possible at this institution and probably also at one or two

other places on which as yet we have no report.

If quality graduate instruction in Russian is to expand, two things are needed at once: endowments and better library facilities. Today all professorships in Russian, as in all the Slavic field, are supported from general university funds, or from temporary allotments from Foundations. There is not a single "named" professorship in Rus-

sian, a condition impossible to imagine in parallel fields like the German and French. Foundations cannot make up for this lack, as their donations are for specific short periods and for cultivation purposes only, and are soon withdrawn. It is time endowments were found, and here well-to-do Russians or Russian organizations could well step in and save the situation. Perhaps what is needed is promotion work, perhaps we should take a leaf from the book of specialists in

money-raising for philanthropic purposes.

f

d

e

r

ia

15

n

re

ne

ls

ia

be

S-

VO

gs

ay

ed

m

15-

Besides endowments, improved library facilities are needed if Russian studies are to expand. Here coordination of planning is as important as money. Surveys should be made by disinterested individuals or organizations to determine which branch of the perfectly vast Russian field a given library should properly develop, in the light of what it already has and of the natural trend of student and teacher interest. The Slavic Center now being established in the Library of Congress could perform a valuable service here, but the danger is that it will become, not the clearing house it should, but a kind of super-library that will compete with local libraries, which by their very nature are in closer touch with the students' needs and also more accessible.

Up to now, nine out of ten of the doctorates in Russian granted in this country have been in the field of literature. This is hardly likely to be the case in the future. In addition to History and the Social Sciences, which are obvious fields for expansion and already well cultivated, there are two other fields offering alluring possibilities: pedagogy and pure science. Not every good teacher wants, or needs, the specialized discipline of the course leading to the Ph.D. For some the Doctorate in Education, with major interest centering on the special problems imposed by Russian, seems made to order. So far only one course in the teaching of Russian has ever been announced. This was the one offered by Mr. Peter Pertzoff in the summer session of 1944 at Cornell University. Unfortunately, the course did not materialize. There were not enough students.

In the field of pure science the graduate schools have only begun to admit the importance of Russian, and so far a mere handful of universities have provided their scientific students with opportunities for acquiring the basic elements of scientific Russian quickly. At Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Dr. Znamensky has pioneered in this, and a much-needed textbook has grown out of his work. At Northwestern, J. G. Tolpin has been doing the same thing, devising as he has gone along a system of short-cuts, whereby the young sci-

entist is no longer required to master Pushkin before getting at the problems of oil refining in the Caucasus, in which he is interested. At the University of Oregon, also, scientific Russian is receiving encouragement. Out of the interest in this branch, it may be added, has grown a demand for instruction in Russian literature at Oregon, and the novelist Nina Fedorova is to be in charge of this work beginning this autumn.

If it is to the graduate schools that Russian instruction in this country owes its beginning, it is to the undergraduate college to which it owes its present phenomenal expansion. In the course of the last two years, close to seventy colleges and universities have provided some sort of course in Russian language. Many of these were, to be sure, part of the celebrated Army Specialized Training Program, which came and went with the wind, but many others were not, and often, in places where instruction began as an Army-sponsored venture, it remained when the Army support was withdrawn. The colleges and universities in which Russian has been taught recently or is being taught at this moment are as follows:

University of Alabama Antioch College Barnard College (by arrangement with Columbia) Beaver College Boston University Bowdoin College Brooklyn College Brown University Bryn Mawr Bucknell University University of California University of Chicago College of the City of New York University of Colorado Columbia University University of Connecticut Connecticut College for Women Cornell University Dartmouth College Detroit Institute of Technology Harvard University Hunter College University of Idaho University of Illinois Illinois Institute of Technology

University of Indiana Iowa State College University of Iowa Kansas State College Knox College Leland Stanford University Loyola University Massachusetts Institute of Technology University of Michigan Middlebury College Mills College University of Minnesota University of Nebraska New York University Northwestern University Ohio State University University of Oklahoma University of Oregon University of Pennsylvania Princeton University Radcliffe College Redlands University Sacramento Junior College Smith College University of Southern California Syracuse University

U

U

T

U

U

al

tie

le

en

al

sc

scl

on

see

sin

sia

by

de

are

me

sec

ade

ish

to

obl

san

ous

unc

tea

of a

niq

Wa

Wa

University of Texas University of Toledo Tufts College Vassar College University of Virginia University of Washington

Youngstown College

Wayne University
Wellesley College
Western Reserve University
Wheaton College
University of Wisconsin
Yale University

To the above should be added the following institutions which, although they can not properly be classified as colleges or universities, do, nevertheless, offer competent Russian instruction of college level: American Russian Institute, Jefferson School of Social Science, The Iranian Institute, and the New School of Social Research, all of which are in New York City.

Also to be noted, as offering Russian, are two excellent private schools: Chatham Hall in Virginia, and The Putney School in Putney, Vermont. Russian would undoubtedly expand greatly in private schools, if the latter could be certain the language would be accepted on a par with other modern languages for college entrance. There seems to be need for clarification and stabilization at this point. In the above list, Sacramento Junior College deserves special attention, since this was probably the first institution of its type to offer Russian. As early as 1928 courses in Russian language were given here by Dr. John L. Seymour, then abandoned after 1931 for lack of student interest, but subsequently resumed in 1942.

The prospects for introducing Russian into the public high school are at present none too bright, for two reasons: first, because enrollment in other modern languages is abruptly on the decline, and, second, because of the great increase in budget demands which the addition of Russian would entail, since the average teacher of Spanish or French, who finds himself without pupils, can not switch over to Russian and a new teacher has to be taken on, with all the long obligations of tenure and pension, etc., which this implies. At the same time, if the demand were great enough and sufficiently vociferous, a number of high schools, especially in our large cities, would undoubtedly offer Russian. The problem of competently trained teachers is a factor here, also.

There is a good chance for the expansion of Russian in the field of adult education by way of radio, as the experiments with this technique carried out by Professor Ivar Spector in the University of Washington clearly prove. Campus Studios, of the University of Washington, has made available a series of ten radio lessons by Pro-

fessor Spector. Radio, it would appear, could be made to do for the wide, general public what the "eclectic orientation course," as it is called by Professor Cross, is expected to do for the general college student, namely, capture his interest in the new field and inspire

him to explore the field further.

The orientation course just mentioned has a host of champions in our colleges and universities, among these, besides Professor Cross himself, Ernest Simmons of Cornell, who has built up around such a course (given in English, naturally) a thriving summer school of Slavic Studies, and Dimitri von Mohrenschildt of Dartmouth, whose courses in Russian history and literature may well become the germ of another similar school.

The American Association of Teachers of Slavonic and East European Languages is currently conducting a survey of the present status of Russian instruction in the United States. Anyone having any information along this line is urgently invited to communicate with the writer. In the report of findings, which will be published, full credit will be given unless it is stated specifically that the information

is confidential.

fev hay to gin a t

tim

of

ma fail abo ext Gu on

taig

from Sibe first Situ

the 12-1

1]

Mangazeia: A Boom Town of Seventeenth Century Siberia

By RAYMOND H. FISHER

THE PHENOMENON of the boom town, with its quickly run cycle of rapid growth, great prosperity, and sudden death, is known to most Americans. The ghost towns of the mining and lumber industries scattered throughout the West are reminders of days of once teeming life. But of boom towns outside the United States few are known to Americans, those of Alaska and South Africa perhaps being the best known. Americans will be surprised, therefore, to learn that three centuries ago, when Englishmen were only beginning to settle in the New World, Siberia experienced just such a town. This town was Mangazeia, and it was furs, not mineral or timber wealth, that made for its great prosperity.

Mangazeia is not on the map of Siberia today. Except for a few maps of Russian or German compilation, even the historical maps fail to locate this town.² Mangazeia was located on the Taz River about 120 miles from its mouth. The Taz Gulf forms a curved arm, extending eastward, then southward, of the Ob Gulf, and into Taz Gulf empties the river of the same name. Mangazeia's position was on the border line between the arctic tundra and the great Siberian

taiga.

The geographical position of Mangazeia explains much of its brief history. By river and gulf, as well as by sea, it was accessible from Russia. In fact, as we shall note later, Russian relations with Siberia during the 16th century were such as to place Mangazeia first among the regions of Siberia to be exploited by the Russians. Situated on the border line between tundra and taiga, Mangazeia

¹Pronounced Man-gah-zyéa-yah.

²The exception to this statement is the maps in Robert J. Kerner, *The Urge to the Sea*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1942, maps nos. 12-14.

was in a fine position to exploit the animal resources of both vegetation belts. The variety of fur-bearing animals in both belts was considerable. At the same time the arctic location of the town meant that other natural resources easily exploited were largely lacking. Agriculture was out of the question. Even if there were mineral deposits, the Russian economic system then was insufficiently developed to exploit them. Timber there was plentiful, but so was it in Russia, and it has been only in recent years that the Russian-Siberian timber resources of the taiga have been developed extensively. A sparse native population with a self-sufficient economy was a poor basis for commerce. So, only furs could be profitably exploited here. When they ran out, there was nothing else to take their place. Thus the physio-

graphical set-up for a boom town.

In fur-bearing animals the region to which Mangazeia gave access was abundant. The tundra area yielded the highly valued arctic or blue foxes especially. The forested areas yielded a wide variety: sables, ermines, martens, and several varieties of foxes were the most important. Beavers, otters, wolverines, squirrels, minks were some of the other animals to be found. Sables, black foxes, and arctic foxes brought the highest prices, but whereas the latter two were relatively scarce, good sables were found in abundance. Indeed, Mangazeia was looked upon as a sort of gold mine, a Siberian California, because of the ease with which all kinds of fur-bearing animals could be acquired there. It was quite easy to obtain sables which would sell for 5 to 20 rubles apiece, and black foxes worth 50 to as much as 300 rubles could be obtained. These were high prices for those days. With one haul a pauper could become a rich man. For example, in 1623 a Mangazeia official reported to Moscow that one Ivan Afanasiev had stolen two black fox skins, one valued at 30 r. and the other at 80 r. With these 110 r., it has been calculated, Ivan could have bought 55 acres of land, erected a good cabin, purchased five horses, twenty head of cattle, twenty sheep, several dozen fowl, and still have had about half of his capital left over.

The area for which Mangazeia became the point of entry was extensive. Roughly it was the northwestern quarter of Siberia; that is, the lower portions of the basins of the Enisei and Lena Rivers. From Mangazeia traders and trappers pushed eastward along the Turukhan River to its juncture with the Enisei. Here they could sail down the Enisei to its mouth, or cross it, and proceed up the Lower Tunguska, an eastern tributary, to its source, thence by portage to the Viliui, a western tributary of the Lena, by which the whole lower

cen lak rou clin

not was was elevare basis because in fixent sian Fixent Nor

opmin E the this fur bega pelts Sibin

afte

the

try a

⁸Si Tobo Russia

strer

Lena basin could be reached. Until the middle of the seventeenth century this was a well-travelled route. Then, with the founding of lakutsk and the development of the Irtysh-Angara-upper Lena route, the Lena basin was more easily reached that way, and the decline of Mangazeia followed quickly.

II.

Just when the Russians first learned of the Mangazeia region is not known. But this much is clear: the country around Mangazeia was the first part of Siberia to become known to the Russians, and it was the part first to be heavily exploited by them. As early as the eleventh century the tribute-gathering expeditions from Novgorod are known to have crossed the northern Urals, from the Pechora basin to the Ob Gulf. The area between the Urals and the Ob Gulf became known in the sixteenth century as Obdoriia. Early in that century traders from the northern Russian towns established a trade in furs with the Samoyeds living there, and by the middle of the century the Russians had pushed into the Taz country to trade. Russian settlement, however, did not occur until the turn of the century.

For nearly a century, then, the country around Mangazeia was known to the fur traders of northern Russia, and to the English and Dutch merchants who came to Kholmogory at the mouth of the Northern Dvina River to acquire Russian furs (also to Archangel after 1585). It was not until the end of the sixteenth century that the way was prepared for Russian occupation of the Mangazeia country and for the intensive exploitation of its fur resources. Two developments brought this about. One was a great increase in the demand in Europe for furs. The expansion of Europe's overseas trade and the influx of precious metals from the New World help to explain this sharp rise in the demand for furs. Under this demand Russia's fur resources were critically depleted, and Russian fur merchants began to look eastward to Siberia as a new and abundant source of pelts. The second development was the conquest of the khanate of Sibir⁸ by Ermak in 1581. This conquest revealed that the strength of the khanate had been exaggerated by the Russians. This imagined strength had led the Muscovite tsars to oppose Russian penetration

1

r

(-

s,

m

(-

n n-

ne

er

^{*}Sibir, the capital of this Tatar khanate, was situated not far from the site of Tobolsk. Applying first only to this khanate, the name Sibir was extended by the Russians to all northern Asia coming under their rule.

into that part of Siberia, thus channeling the first Russian penetration farther north towards Mangazeia. But the relative ease with which the khanate of Sibir was broken persuaded Ivan IV to change from a hands-off policy towards that neighbor to one of taking over the conquest, and furthering it so that the state might acquire valuable fur tribute. Great demand for furs, exhaustion of the Russian fur supply, and overthrow of the political barrier to eastward advance of the Russians set the stage for the appearance, not long afterwards, of Mangazeia as a boom town.

III.

Mangazeia was established on the Taz River in 1601 by an expedition sent out by Moscow. When it reached the region, it found Russian traders already active there. In fact, fearful lest the extension of Moscow's authority to this region would restrict their activities, Russian traders had incited the successful attack upon a previous expedition by the Samoyed natives. With the construction of a fort (ostrog) began an existence that lasted forty-two years, until 1643,

when the town was destroyed by fire.

Inasmuch as Mangazeia was established by the state as an administrative and defensive center, it was fortified. In 1625, at the height of its prosperity, the physical outlines of the town consisted of five towers, twenty to thirty feet high, joined by a wall ten feet high and a thousand feet in perimeter. The upper part of the towers extended out beyond the wall so that any attackers could be fired upon. Cannons were placed in these towers, which commanded each corner. The fifth tower stood over the entrance to the stockade. Walls and towers were made of wood, as were the buildings inside. Within the stockade were the house and office of the voevoda (the chief military and administrative official), the customs house, two churches, a jail, barns, and merchants' shops.

The permanent settlers, most of whom were soldiers and officials, numbered about seventy. Annually a new shift of soldiers was sent from Tobolsk, the principal administrative center in Western Siberia. A transient population of 600 to 1000 merchants and trappers lived in the town. Most of them stayed for a season only, either to winter there until the spring thaws opened the way for river travel, or to summer there for trade. A small number of civilians made it their permanent headquarters. But Mangazeia was not a residential community. The bulk of its population remained for short periods

by the eas kno

of

hij

fro alo Vyo by s war and

arn

to be the age low gulf

usec

the from T the rest cally pelts

Man way Man vision affore shall

in go and t

and 1

of time. Most of it was in a process of coming or going. This feature, highly characteristic of boom towns, is clearly noticeable in the case

of Mangazeia.

n

d

1-

us

rt

3,

n-

ht

ve

nd

led

ın-

he

ers

ck-

ind

ail,

als,

ent

Si-

pers

r to

vel,

le it itial iods

Mangazeia was reached ordinarily by three routes, and sometimes by a fourth. The earliest used route crossed the northern Urals from the Pechora River. This route left the Pechora at the Usa River, an eastern tributary, proceeded up that river to a portage commonly known as the Kamen, thence down the Sob River, a western tributary of the Ob. The route then passed through the Ob Gulf into its arm, Taz Gulf, and to Mangazeia. The Pechora, in turn, was reached from Kholmogory (or Archangel) by a series of rivers and portages along the arctic littoral, or fom Vologda and Usting by way of the Vychegda and Vym Rivers. The second route, also used early, was by sea from Kholmogory or Archangel through the White Sea, eastward along the coast to the Ial-mal peninsula, across it by rivers and portage to the Ob and Taz Gulfs. The third route was the last to be opened, but it became the official route of the state. Leaving the Volga River system by way of the Kama River, this route portaged thence to Verkhoturie (on the upper Tura). From there it followed the Tura, Tobol, and Irtysh Rivers to the Ob, down it to its gulf and the Taz Gulf. The fourth, a roundabout route occasionally used, went up instead of down the Irtysh, thence by tributaries to the Enisei, down it to the Turukhan River, and entered Mangazeia from the east along that river.

The Kamen route, the first, became in the seventeenth century the main route back to Russia from Mangazeia, as well as from the rest of Siberia. It offered the advantage of downstream travel practically all the way to Usting (an important wholesale market for pelts). The ocean route was considerably used until Moscow ordered it closed in 1619 to keep foreigners out of the rich region around Mangazeia. The third route, the southern one, was the principal way of entry into Siberia and Mangazeia. For eastward travel to Mangazeia much of this route was downstream. Too, since the provisions and articles of trade were often bulky and heavy, this route afforded easier travel into Siberia than did the marshy stretches and shallow rivers of the Kamen route. However, the fewer provisions and lighter weight of the pelts permitted the use of the Kamen route in going out of Siberia. Hence the eastward journey by one route

and the westward by another.

IV.

I

0

fi

W

th

ar

fu

tr

th

F

tit

an

ga

sel

the

qu Ho

M:

tra

oth

stat

to

tsai

Sib

zim

gaz

Wer

the

una

sed

tim

cou

hos

Just when the economic life of Mangazeia began to take on the features of a boom town can not be ascertained clearly. Official archival data do not go back beyond 1626. The internal disorders of Russia's Times of Trouble (1605-1613) did not aid accurate record keeping, and most of what records were kept were destroyed by fire in that year. But the data of the years 1626-1628 reveal those years as the high point of Mangazeia's prosperity. It was not until after 1642 that there is a marked decline. We may reasonably conclude, therefore, that Mangazeia's prosperity was well established by the end of the first decade of the seventeenth century. It can only be guessed how adversely the Times of Trouble affected that trade. Probably not very much, for the traders who went to Mangazeia came from northern Russia, which was least affected by the social disturbances and Polish occupation.

In order to gain some idea of the size of the fur trade of the Mangazeia region the available figures for the tithe collected there by the state are listed:

1626	14,062 r.	1637	13,729 r.
1627	15,492	1638	11,443
1628	15,354	1641	11,812
1631	12,952	1642	12,594
1635	10,749	1646	5,113
1636	17 265		

By themselves these figures mean little or nothing; explained, they reveal much. First, the tithe was a ten per cent tax on furs and other raw goods; that is, the state took one pelt out of ten from all grades of all pelts trapped. Hence, these figures show that as the result of private business activity furs to the value of ten times these figures passed through Mangazeia. Second, the value of the ruble in the seventeenth centry was twelve to fifteen times that of the prerevolutionary ruble (51 cents). Third, these figures are in terms of Siberian prices. Moscow and Russian prices for furs were on an average twenty per cent higher. In other words, during the years 1626-1642, private traders and trappers took each year through Mangazeia furs which in the Russian markets and in pre-1914 monetary values were worth between 1,600,000 and 2,590,000 rubles. The importance of this trade through Mangazeia can be further shown by stating that the value of the furs was sometimes twice as great as that of the fur tribute and tithe together taken by the state out of all Siberia then under its jurisdiction (the Kirghiz steppes, the Amur valley, and Kamchatka were not then under Russian rule). Indeed, insofar as the figures available show, Iakutsk became the only other center in Siberia through which a comparable amount of furs passed. It was a high tribute to the fur wealth of Mangazeia when the officials who recommended the establishment of forts in the Lena basin stated that the Lena River country would become another Mangazeia.

d

e

8

T

e

e

e.

12

al

he

re

ed,

ind

all

the

ese

e in

ore-

s of

ver-

26-

lan-

tary

The

own

at as

it of

But private Russian traders were not the only ones who obtained furs in the Mangazeia region. The state required the natives to pay tribute in furs, iasak. During the height of Mangazeia's prosperity, the tribute received varied between 5000 and 9000 rubles in value. Further, it is quite likely that all the figures thus far quoted, both tithe and tribute, are minimum figures, for a fair amount of evasion and bribery occurred in the collection of the tithe, while the tribute gatherers frequently appropriated large numbers of furs for themselves, or acquired by trade with the natives the better furs and took the less desirable ones as tribute. In one year, the collectors so acquired for themselves 12,000 pelts and took only 3,600 for tribute. How many furs went out of Mangazeia through illicit channels can not be said, but the number must have been considerable.

V.

In mentioning two major sources of fur income that came from Mangazeia, we have suggested that there were two parts to the fur trade in Siberia. The state conducted one part, private traders the other. Both participants were active in the Mangazeia region. The state, in fact, was the most important single participant. The wealth to be obtained as fur tribute was the principal reason for the tsars' extending their dominion over Mangazeia and the rest of Siberia. To collect the tribute from the natives, blockhouses, called zimoviia (winter quarters), were built at various points in the Mangazeia area. Altogether fifteen of them were built. State collectors went to these blockhouses annually to receive the tribute. Because the natives in this part of Siberia were nomadic, the state found itself unable to set up the systematic form of collection possible with the sedentary tribes. In Mangazeia tax lists, definite payments at regular times and specified places were out of the question. Instead, the state could only hope to attract the natives to these blockhouses by holding hostages—when they could be captured, and then they had to be treated well—and by giving foodstuffs and other goods in exchange for the tribute. As a result, the tribute rate per native was low, about two sables, as against five to ten elsewhere in Siberia. The number who payed tribute fluctuated widely. One year it might be as low as 200, another year as high as 3000. Nor did the representatives of a given clan pay their tribute at the same blockhouse each year. Both natives and state collectors were fearful of one another. The collectors would lock themselves in the blockhouses, and the natives

would pass by, throwing the furs in through the window.

Unlike some parts of Siberia, the overall activity of the private operators in the Mangazeia jurisdiction was greater than that of the state, as the foregoing figures for tithe and tribute receipts show. The number of men who engaged in the private trade varied from year to year. Between 500 and 1000 men passed through Mangazeia yearly in each direction. The bulk of the participants were small operators, either traders or trappers, who worked with a capital of 100 rules or less, many with less than 40 rubles. For instance, 436 men in 1630 brought an average of less than 80 sables apiece through Mangazeia, and in June-July 1641 the value of the pelts carried by 247 men averaged slightly over 100 rubles per man. A few traders worked with a capital of as much as 1000 to 1500 rubles. The largest amount of capital taken into Siberia through Mangazeia was 5500 rubles in money. Such operators were true entrepreneurs, who hired agents and employees to acquire the furs while they directed their operations from Moscow or some other town in Russia. Even the small scale operators usually came from Russia, though some remained permanently in Siberia. The feature of this trade particularly to be noticed is that, with the state's engaging in it as the biggest participant, no private monopolies, or even a predominance of a few big operators, emerged. The private trade in Mangazeia was chiefly the activity of many small entrepreneurs.

Though the fur trade everywhere tends to be seasonal in character, geography and climate made it especially so at Mangazeia. Transportation had to be water-borne. Hence, travel between Russia and Mangazeia, and between Mangazeia and the hunting grounds farther east, was restricted to the warm summer months when the rivers were not frozen over or choked with ice. Men travelling to Mangazeia entered Siberia at Verkhoturie, usually in April. If they entered via the Kamen crossing and Sob River, they entered a few weeks later. For river travel flat-bottomed boats, called doshchaniki, were used. They measured as much as fifty feet in length, carried

rive and lar arra froi wer

bot

ing if the mig wait ing dition wait

have

ling

mon

a bu thou rubl fron after reach reve cours but o

drink of the the t its pr

comr

only or ea trave carrie years groun

amou

both oars and sails, and the largest could carry fifty men with provisions and goods. At Sob (a small settlement at the mouth of that river) change was made to ocean boats for sailing through the Ob and Taz Gulfs. These boats, kochi, were decked, but otherwise similar to the river boats. Since most of the men did not own boats, they arranged to travel with those who did, or occasionally rented boats from the state. For protection and mutual assistance boat caravans were formed. Travel was not rapid, especially to Mangazeia. Leaving Tobolsk in mid-July, one might reach Mangazeia in September if the gulf winds were favorable. If not, as often was the case, arrival

might not occur until November, or even January.

During the winter there was little travel or activity. Men simply waited the winter out, engaging in a limited amount of trade, repairing their equipment, organizing hunting parties, and purchasing additional provisions if needed. It was a period of preparation and waiting. The enforced idleness of the long winter months must also have been whiled away with drinking and gambling. A tax on gambling provided the state with a tidy sum that was a minor source of money income at Mangazeia. The demand for liquor was such that a bucketful of wine commanded a price of 15 rubles, profit of a thousand per cent. At that price one brewer took in a gross of 8000 rubles in 1620. In fact, so profitable was the liquor business under frontier conditions, the state took it over as a government monopoly after 1620. Such monopolies were not uncommon then, for the state reached out and appropriated to itself the most profitable sources of revenue. The heavy drinking suggested by these figures is not, of course, to be interpreted necessarily as a sign of moral depravity, but of the need for stimulants in a very severe climate. One liquor common among these men was miod (mead), a fermented honey drink which was effective as an anti-scorbutic. The state's monopoly of the manufacture and sale of this liquor worked a real hardship on the trappers, so later the government relaxed the restriction upon its private importation into Siberia.

With the coming of spring and early summer, those who came only to trade could finish their business and return to Russia by fall or early winter. Those who engaged in trapping spent the summer in travelling to the hunting grounds. The hunting itself was ordinarily carried on in the winter. Hunters might remain out two or three years before returning to Mangazeia. The distance to the hunting ground, the richness in fur-bearing animals of the area, and the amount of provisions determined the length of stay. Thus a man

1-

1-

ı,

had

the

tha

de

not

to

Tu

doc nar Ma

ory

few

Bu

tha

oth

who

164

Sibi

Puro

outs

194

which

atter

might spend from two to five years in the journey from Russia and back. Besides trapping, the Russians often traded with the natives. It was this coming and going of hundreds of men each year—some on their way to hunting grounds, others returning to Russia, and still others remaining to trade—which gave an atmosphere of bustle and life to this far northern town. The only thing permanent about it was the impermanence of its inhabitants.

VI.

Siberia in the seventeenth century was a colony for Russia in an era when most European states claiming greatness sought colonies. Because Siberia is contiguous to Russia, its then colonial character is not at first realized. But Siberia provided Russia and its tsars with a virgin source of wealth, furs—furs that were as valuable to Russia as the gold and silver of Peru and Mexico were to Spain, and the accumulated wealth of India was to England. With these furs Russia could acquire manufactured goods from the West and protect itself from becoming an economic dependency of the more advanced economies of England, Holland, and Germany. To the extent that Mangazeia was for many years the major source of the furs which came out of Siberia, it possessed value beyond the worth of the fur in rubles and kopeks. Of this value the Russians were fully aware. It was fear lest they lose control over the exploitation of Mangazeia and Siberia to foreigners, if not the territory itself, that led the Russians in 1619 to close the sea route to Mangazeia, the only route by which foreigners could reach its precious "fur mines." Thus, Mangazeia's historical significance is to be measured not in its short life span, but in the new wealth it provided Russia at an important time in its history.

The decline of Mangazeia, when it came, came quickly in the 1640's. The prosperity of the town was dependent upon its virtual monopoly of access to the lower Enisei and lower Lena basins. In 1631 Iakutsk was built on the middle Lena and within a decade had extended its jurisdiction far to the north and east. More easily and safely reached than Mangazeia by the southern Ob-Irtysh-Angara-Lena route, Iakutsk began to displace Mangazeia as the point of entry into the rich lower Lena area and into the Indigirka and other river regions of north-eastern Siberia. But perhaps the most important cause of Mangazeia's decline was the exhaustion of the supply of fur-bearing animals. Forty and more years of heavy exploitation

had denuded the surrounding areas of the greatest and best part of the supply of these animals. The coup de grace came in 1643. In that year fire destroyed the town of Mangazeia. With the signs of decline already clear, the state decided that rebuilding the town was not worth the cost, and so it moved its offices, officials, and employees to the town of Turukhansk farther east, at the juncture of the Turukhan with the Enisei, and renamed it New Mangazeia. But even this reminder of the once most prosperous town in Siberia was doomed to oblivion. In time New Mangazeia resumed its original name, Turukhansk, and so it appears on modern maps. The old Mangazeia disappeared, from the map and, in time, from the memory of man. It is doubtful that today even the Russians, except for a few scholars and inhabitants of the region, ever heard of Mangazeia. But in its time the "golden fleece" of its abounding sables was a lure that attracted thousands, some to disaster by death or bankruptcy, others to quick and great wealth. Truly it was a pioneer boom town.

ın

12

he Is-

ect

ed

at

ch

irs

re.

eia

IS-

by inife me

In had and uraenenoply The most complete account of Mangazeia is a short monograph in Russian based wholly on archival data: Petr N. Butsinsky, Mangazeia i mangazeiskii uezd (1601-1645 gg.), Kharkov, 1893. Sergei V. Bakrushin, Ocherki po istorii kolonizatsii Sibiri v XVI i XVII vv. Leningrad, 1925, contains additional material. Samuel Purchas, Hakluyt Posthumus or Purchas His Pilgrimes, vols. XI-XIII, Glasgow and New York, 1906, contains the only contemporary information about Mangazeia outside of Russian sources. My own study, The Russian Fur Trade, 1550-1700, 1943, gives citations from other scattered sources as well as the Siberian setting of which Mangazeia was a part. Beyond these works Mangazeia has received scant attention from scholars.

Book Reviews

TREVIRANUS, G. R. Revolutions in Russia. New York and London, Harper, 1944. 303 pp. \$3.00.

DURANTY, WALTER. USSR. Philadelphia - New York, Lippincott, 1944. 293 pp. \$3.00.

FISCHER, MARKOOSHA. My Lives In Russia. New York and London, Harper, 1944. 269 pp. \$2.75.

PRUSZYNSKI, XAVIER. Russian Year. New York, Roy, 1944. 189 pp. \$2.50.

The four authors whose books are reviewed here differ widely in background, experience, and attitude toward modern Russia. Although sympathetic towards some of the achievements of the Russian Revolution, they differ in their interpretation of it. Each has something to contribute to the current knowledge of Russia.

The author of Revolutions in Russia is a German refugee with a varied career. He was a submarine commander during World War I, member of the Reichstag at the time of the German Republic, and held a post in the Bruening Cabinet in 1930-32. Having barely escaped the Gestapo, he has been residing in recent years in the United States and Canada.

Mr. Treviranus writes as an historian and a philosopher, rather than as a journalist or a politician with an ax to grind. His book is largely the product of research, and, to a lesser degree, of his personal experience and contacts (indirect, it would seem) with the Russian scene. The author seems

especially anxious to show that the gulf between Russia and the West can and must be bridged. Len

cial

be

deat

pror

equa

apos

Rus

prov

man

denc

tenti

faile

evol

seen

to c

man

Rus

tian

ling

es n

man

itua

even

seen

part

revo

and,

bool

of n

Che

oton

Bry:

shou

lovit

Gori

ant.

Eng

Priz

a lor

a co Time

the their

W

It

T

T

More than half of Mr. Treviranus' book is devoted to an historical resumé of the revolutionary movement in Tsarist Russia and the Bolsheviks' rise to power. On the whole, the author gives a judicious appraisal of the forces that led to the downfall of the Tsar and the Provisional government, and the establishment of the Soviet régime. There is an abundance of factual data and well-chosen quotations from Lenin's writings and speeches.

Unfortunately, there are also a number of errors and questionable The following are statements. some: Russian civil law was codified under Nicholas I, not under Alexander II (p. 3); Gorchakov did not negotiate the renewal of the Reinsurance Treaty in 1890he was dead (p. 6); the Treaty of Portsmouth was scarcely an act of "capitulation" on the part of Russia (p. 14); it is not true that Russia was the only world power "willing to risk a major conflagration" in 1914 (p. 63); General Graves commanded Americans in the Far East, not in Murmansk (p. 152).

Subsequent chapters treat summarily such topics as: industrialization and collectivization, the Comintern, the Greek Orthodox Church, Stalin's foreign and domestic policy, and the Red Army. At the end of the volume there is a valuable annotated bibliography of source material in German, Russian, and English.

The author is a great admirer of

Lenin—"the prophet of a new social order." Stalin would seem to be the apostate. After Lenin's death, "his creed petered out. It promised social justice and social equality. It will find followers and apostles beyond the boundaries of Russia as long as no other faith proves a superior integrator of mankind."

ŀ

d

'n

1-

br

nd

é-

IC-

a-

nd

1

ble

are

di-

der

VOZ

of O_

of

of

us-

us-

vill-

on"

ves

Far

).

um-

iali-

the

dox

do-

rmy.

re 15

aphy

Rus-

er of

There appears to be little evidence to support the author's contention that collective farming has failed and that "the most practical evolution for Russian agriculture seems a change from collectivism to co-operative development." To many the parallelism between Russian Communism and Christian ideology would seem startling: "Russian Communism stresses man's duties toward his fellow man, therefore recognizes the spiritual ties of Christian brotherhood even if by violent heresy."

The last chapters of the book seem less illuminating than the first part devoted to the survey of the revolutionary movement.

It is unfortunate that this honest and, on the whole, informative book contains so many misspellings of names. Thus, to mention a few: Checheglovitov, Rosdjanko, Marmoton, Guri, Bruce C. Scopper, Louis Bryant, William A. Rhys; these should read respectively: Shcheglovitov, Rodzianko, Mamontov, Gori, Bruce C. Hopper, Louise Bryant, and Albert Rhys Williams.

Walter Duranty is a brilliant Englishman who made a reputation as a reporter on Russia (Pulitzer Prize winner in 1932). In spite of a long residence in Russia—he was a correspondent of the New York Times from 1921 to 1933—Duranty remained aloof, contemptuous of the Russian people, indifferent to their fate. He watched the Revolu-

tion as one would a stage show or a horse race. His latest book, USSR, is like his preceding ones, personal and dramatic, with many brilliant characterizations and

many startling judgments.

Of special interest are the chapters devoted to the conflict within the Communist Party, the Famine of 1932, and the Treason Trials. The two protagonists, Stalin and Trotsky, are thus shrewdly characterized: "Trotsky was brilliant in word and action, gifted with intuition, adept in the art of popularity, quick to seize an opportunity, but self-centered and intellectually arrogant. Stalin was slower-minded, forced to plod where Trotsky leapt, no less ambitious than the other but willing to submerge himself and wait." One wonders if Mr. Duranty's explanation of Trotsky's defeat as largely due to his failure to attend Lenin's funeral, is not an oversimplification. The author himself recognizes elsewhere in the book that there were other important factors in Trotsky's downfall (his unpopularity within the Party, for instance).

Mr. Duranty's explanation of the great "Man-Made Famine" of 1932 is interesting, but not very convincing. "Japan was poised to strike," says the author, "and the Red Army needed reserves of food and gasoline." This critical situation, according to Mr. Duranty, was the reason for accelerating grain collections in the stricken areas.

The Treason Trials are ingeniously connected with the international situation and, likewise, the opposition of the Old Bolsheviks to Stalin's policies is connected with Hitler's attempt to develop a Fifth Column in Russia. Original, certainly, is the author's explanation of the confessions: "Thus the Russians, especially men of high calibre like Piatakov and Bukharin, had 'sinned' against the Party Line and the Kremlin, as the Earl of Essex had sinned against God and 'God's annointed,' Queen Elizabeth." Mr. Duranty recognizes the injury of the purge to national morale and public opinion abroad, but he justifies the purge on the ground that "it eliminated completely Nazi plans for a Fifth Col-

umn in the U.S.S.R."

The book contains a number of historical errors: Empress Alexandra, wife of Nicholas II, although a German Princess, became a fervent Russian patriot, and there is not the slightest evidence that she ever considered negotiating a separate peace with Germany (p. 21); the President of the Duma, Rodzianko, was not a general (p. 26); the split in the S.D. Party occurred in London in 1903 and not in 1902 (p. 28, note); the Commander-in-Chief of the Russian armies at the time of the Brest-Litovsk negotiations was General Dukhonin and not Bukhonin (p. 38); The Red Terror was proclaimed by Lenin four months before the attempt on his life by Dora Kaplan (p. 51); it is very doubtful that 80 percent of the peasants were against the Whites during the Civil War, their attitude being more, "a plague on both your houses" (p. 62); it is difficult to see how the Russian mir or village commune helped the Soviet government to collectivize agriculture (p. 185).

Mr. Duranty's USSR is good journalism and makes entertaining reading, but it is not an objective and considerate account of a quar-

ter-century of Soviet rule.

In experience and background, Markoosha Fischer possesses a great advantage over many an observer of present day Russia. She was born in Tsarist Russia and she also lived in Soviet Russia under Lenin and Stalin. She knows Russia from the inside. Yet there is one drawback in her experience which limits, to some extent, the value of her reporting—she is bitterly disappointed in the course the Revolution has taken.

The author of My Lives In Russia is the wife of Louis Fischer, for many years correspondent of the Nation. Both Fischers were on intimate terms with the original, internationally-minded group of Bolshevik leaders. They were enthusiastic supporters of the Revolution. But revolutions are inexorable and often merciless to their offspring, and in the purges of 1936-38, the Fischers lost many of their intim-

ate friends.

The author insists that Americans must know both sides of Soviet Russia: "the good aspects of Russian life—human equality, economic progress without exploitation, education of the masses, social security, lack of racial discrimination..." as well as the bad ones—"suppression of freedom, regimentation of spirit, and political terror." The approach is sound, but the "bad" features of Soviet life existed from the outset of the Soviet régime—only the Fischers were not aware of them until 1936.

The book has considerable merit as an honest and detailed account of the daily life of an average Sov-

iet citizen.

Thus, on conditions during the first Five Year Plan the author says: "When I expected Louis back from his annual trip to the United States [in March 1930], I hunted for days to find some delicacy for his first meal at home. All I was able to get was a bunch of

chil

with

pea

froz

C

no v [the all jail. O poli outv Sov

calle prol joyo ly ir lega 'gen simi denl

thei

hear iled, Ever the : Lool Bols yet'.

C

Ukra word nour rest. publ with

been this, phot zen dated withered carrots, a handful of dried peas, a pickle, a herring, and a few frozen apples."

On the indoctrination of Soviet children: "Once Vitya asked me:

'Where do people live abroad?'
'In houses, of course.'
'But who builds them?'

'Workers.'

He smiled at me condescend-

ingly.

'Don't you know that there are no workers abroad, only bourzhoui [the bourgeois]? The workers are all Communists and they are in

jail.

e

1-

of

2-

al

a-

n-

T-

ut

fe

V-

re

rit

int

V-

he

101

uis

the

, I

eli-

All

of

On manners: "For many years, polite manners were considered an outworn bourgeois tradition in the Soviet Union. Parents who wanted their children to be polite were called old-fashioned, if not antiproletarian. But when the era of joyous, prosperous life was officially inaugurated, good manners were legalized... 'Kindness,' 'politeness,' 'generosity,' 'humanitarian,' and similarly long-forgotten words suddenly invaded Soviet phraseology."

On the treason trials: "'Did you hear that so-and-so was shot, exiled, arrested, committed suicide?' Every conversation started with the same whispering questions. .' Look, there goes X. He is an old Bolshevik but he is not arrested

yet'."

On the purge of Kossior, chief Communist administrator of Ukraine: "When he was purged no word appeared in the press. No announcement was made of his arrest. No charge against him was published. He just disappeared without a trace and he has never been heard of from that day to this. Only the suppression of his photograph told the observing citizen that Kossior had been liquidated."

Mrs. Fischer does not believe, like ex-Ambassador Davies, that all the purged were Fifth Columnists. The only evidence against them, she says, was their confessions, and she does not believe in them either. Only a few of those arrested did publicly confess, she thinks, and these did so in the hope of saving their lives.

Mrs. Fischer left Russia and came to the United States with her two sons in 1939; Mr. Fischer came even earlier. Today, the author still believes in the Revolution and that Russia "is young, rich, vigorous, with tremendous possibilities for a wonderful future. The Russians now want the Soviet system improved by translating the new Constitution from paper, where it is

now, into life."

Mr. Pruszynski's Russian Year is a brilliant account of Russia at war. The author is a young Polish journalist, born in Tsarist Russia, who was attached to the Polish Embassy staff in Moscow a year after the German invasion of Russia. He possesses unusual qualifications as an observer of the Russian scene—a knowledge of the Russian language, history and culture, a keen eye, and a sensitive, incisive mind.

Deeply concerned for the future of his country, Mr. Pruszynski deliberately avoids issues that might arouse bitterness. He writes with

objectivity and restraint.

The value of the book lies in its searching observations on Soviet personalities, great and small, and scenes of every day life observed in Archangel, Moscow, and Kuibyshev.

While observing the plain, sturdy, and awkward Red Army Officers dancing in a Moscow night club, the author felt a surge of sympathy for them: "They are very young. They are peasants' faces. It is impossible to imagine seeing such faces among Oxford undergraduates, Boul'Mich intellectuals or city clerks—to say nothing of British Army regulars. . . They dance the unending tango with the clumsy correctness of carefully trained animals, conscious

of their strength."

On the way to Kuibyshev, the author's train stopped at a station alongside three other trains, filled with women, old men, and children, and guarded by a special escort. Someone soon discovered who these people were. "'It's one of the autonomous republics migrating to a new place of settlement.' I can well imagine the headlines which such an event would inspire in any other country. . . It was the autonomous republic of the Volga Germans being deported to some unknown lands beyond the Urals."

The author met Stalin at a great banquet at the Kremlin in honor of the late general Sikorsky, then prime minister of Poland. Stalin clearly dominated all his associates and greatly impressed the author by his modesty and unpretentiousness. "Complete calm, determination, ability to shrink from nothing, nothing whatsoever — these were the qualities one could discern

in him that evening."

Perhaps the most interesting chapter in the book is the one devoted to character sketches of four Russians whom the author met: Alexis Tolstoy, Ehrenburg, Helene Usijevich, and Count Ignatiev. Here is Tolstoy: "He is large and heavy, with a large fleshy face, hair brushed long behind the ears, somewhat as the Russian clergy wear it. He speaks in a calm deep bass, very Russian in its tone and

power. He looks at people with slanting, Tartar eyes, also very Russian. . . He is known throughout Russia as a gourmet, of the Parisian type. He writes much with the same abandon with which he eats, drinks, and loves. . . Tolstoy sought in Soviet Russia the old Russia; he wanted to look upon Stalin as Peter the Great. . ."

Interesting, too, is the portrait of the dashing Soviet General, Count Ignatiev, who once held important posts under the Tsar, and as a young page carried the train of Empress Alexandra during her Coronation in 1896: "He's a drawing room sporting and military causeur. A typical officer of the Horse Guards. . . No man could have known more people in one life time — St. Petersburg, Paris, the Far East. . . 'We Marxists,' says Ignatiev to Helene Usijevich, quite earnestly. She laughs. What a Marxist!"

Ehrenburg is the Jewish intellectual, the perennial revolutionary. He, like Helene Usijevich — an old friend of Lenin, is more at home abroad than in the new Russia of Suvorov and Peter the Great.

These four figures "can tell us not only four life stories," says the author, "but also much more of the past and the future of the

country.'

A few errors have crept into Mr. Pruszynski's lively account. The author speaks of the autonomous republics of Mordwa and Mary as Tartar; these are Finnish, not Tartar tribes (p. 6). Speaking of the colony of Volga Germans, the author says that these lands along the Volga "were nearly deserted after their recent liberation [under Catherine the Great] from Tartar rule." (p. 70). Actually, these lands were liberated from the Tartars

Moro Th in the

tw

in

ce

th

Ru for on in

po

Soi t

Da

Du to

a

te

F

all Rus war sym nece the of a

on any pass to the of the control of

ques their P two hundred years before Catherine's reign and were still in the pro-

cess of colonization.

"The Revolution, by bringing to the surface new classes, brought about the predominance of the Mongolian and Asiatic over the European and Slav elements." (p. 98). This statement has no foundation in fact — the Slavs still constitute the overwhelming majority of the population in the U.S.S.R.

In spite of these minor flaws, Russian Year is one of the most informative and entertaining books on Soviet Russia that has appeared

in recent years.

n

it

1-

d

n

25

V-

ry

ne

ld ne

is,

h,

a

el-

ry.

an

at

113-

at.

us

the

of

the

Mr.

The

ous as

the

au-

ong

rted

nder

rtar

inds

tars

Dimitri von Mohrenschildt Dartmouth College

Sorokin, Pitirim A. Russia and the United States, N. Y., Dutton, 1944. 253 pp. \$3.00.

Pares, Bernard. Russia and the Peace. N. Y., Macmillan, 1944. 293 pp. \$2.50.

Dulles, Foster Rhea. The Road to Teheran: The Story of Russia and America, 1781-1943. Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1944. 279 pp. \$2.50.

The authors of these three books all argue in favor of American-Russian collaboration in the postwar period, and one cannot but sympathise with their purpose. The necessity of this collaboration for the establishment and preservation of a lasting peace is so obvious that on this point there hardly can be any disagreement. It is when one passes from this general proposition to the specific arguments which each of the three authors brings forward to support it that one begins to question the validity of some of their assertions.

Professor Sorokin starts with the

premise that for a lasting political alliance, and even for the preservation of a durable peace between any two countries, they must share some "basic values" and must be mu-tually "congenial" in their fundamental traits. He then proceeds to prove that, in her "basic values" and in her "fundamental traits," Russia has been "congenial" with the United States throughout all of her history. In these chapters, dealing with pre-revolutionary Russia the author rightly rejects many prejudiced and stereotyped judgments that have been passed upon that country. But in his spirited attack on these clichés, he at times tries to prove too much, as, for instance, when he asserts that "taken as a whole, the Russian political system from the ninth to the twentieth century was virtually as democratic as the governmental régime of most European nations." There are many other statements in this part of the book, both general and specific, which, it seems to me, are not supported by historical evidence.

There is a similar tendency to exaggerate in the chapters dedicated to the situation in Russia on the eve of the present war. Here Professor Sorokin, taking as his starting point the indubitable fact of the evolution of the Soviet régime, tends to anticipate some of its as yet remote and by no means certain results. Russia might develop into a democracy, and it is to be hoped that she will, but she still has a very long way to go before she can be described as such. And I find it rather difficult to agree with the author's statements about the degree of similarity already achieved between the Russian and the American political and economic systems, especially when I read his own eloquent tribute to the decisive part played in the development of this country by private initiative, voluntary association, and free competition in the intellectual field (pp.

158-160).

Sir Bernard Pares writes on Russia and the peace as a life-long friend of Russia and student of Russian affairs. As was to be expected, one finds in this book, consisting of a series of informal essays on the various aspects of the problem, much that is admirable both in content and in expression. But again, like in the case of Mr. Sorokin, the author's eagerness to prove to himself and to his readers the absence of any insurmountable obstacles on the way to cooperation with Russia, leads him on occasions to take the desired for the achieved. I wish I could believe with Sir Bernard that Bolshevism in Russia is "dead as a doornail," that there has been a "retreat of dictation" under Stalin, that learning has been "restored to objectivity," and that the Constitution of 1936 was frankest recognition of the principle of democracy, only to be curtailed for the time by measures of repression obviously connected with the coming war." One of Sir Bernard's arguments is that the principal victims of Stalin's purges "were precisely the world revolutionists." (Professor Sorokin gives a similar interpretation of the purges). But as a matter of fact, among those liquidated at the time were at least as many "rightists" as "leftists," and their crime was that they opposed the radicalism, not the moderation of Stalin's policies.

Of the three books under review Professor Dulles's is the least controversial, and this is because he bases his contention that Russia and the United States should and can cooperate solely on the basis of similarity of their interests in the international field. In a well written, clear, and succint review of the history of diplomatic relations between the two countries the author shows that, with few exceptions. their foreign policies have run along parallel lines. He adds, however, that from the beginning to the end. there has been a contrast between this parallelism of foreign policies and the conflict in political ideas. That, in his opinion, should not be an obstacle to international cooperation, although he admits that it creates certain difficulties. It is in his discussion of these difficulties that I find the only ground for some disagreement. It seems to me that Professor Dulles over-emphasizes the lack of understanding and the extent of prejudice on the American side, and underestimates the importance of similar factors on the other side. After all, it takes two to make friends. And in the light of the historical record, there is no reason for the Americans to take an excessive mea culpa attitude. Psychologically, we can well doubt the effectiveness of such an approach to the problem of establishing good relations with the present-day Russian leaders. One rather should follow the excellent advice of Sir Bernard Pares: "Always stand up to them—that is what they respect."

ti

ar

th

cu

515

th

w

en

ou

an

So

int

Sc

101

th

the

ha

a

spe

Se

rie

the

lica

tur

Wi

pre

to

ger

boo

art

lish

cou

Son

abo

vot

arti

and

littl

of t

stu

sen

the

as a

rep

thes

mis

nen

MICHAEL KARPOVICH
Harvard University

Mandell, William. The Soviet Far East. New York, The Dial Press, 1944. 158 pp. \$2.50.

It has been a matter of common knowledge that during the past three years the Soviet Union has expended inhuman efforts and enormous material and equipment to industrialize the Soviet Far East.

Especially has it been active in cultivating the hinterland of Siberia and adjacent areas and in making them a source of supply of agricultural food products. On the basis of available reports, it seems that even during the past two years, while the Soviet Union has been engaged in terrific battles to drive out the Nazi invaders, the economic and agricultural development of the Soviet Far East has proceeded uninterruptedly on a gigantic scale. Scattered reports in recent Soviet journals would seem to indicate that the industrialization as well as the agricultural growth of that area have been carried forward on such a vast scale as almost to triple the speed with which the First and Second Five Year Plans were carried out in the Ukraine and behind the Ural area.

t

se

8

e

-

e

0

f

0

n

e

h

d

s-1-

ir

ıp

H

al

m

st

as

nd

nt

st.

In view of this situation, the publication of a book on the subject has to be recognized as a timely venture. Unfortunately, however, Mr. William Mandell, the author of the present volume, has limited himself to compiling information which has generally been known. This small book consists largely of reprints of articles which the author has published in various journals in this country, especially in the monthly Soviet Russia Today, Moreover, about one-third of the book is devoted to lengthy quotations from articles which appeared in Pravda and Izvestiya, and which contain little besides the official panegyrics of the régime. One wonders why a study, ostensibly designed to present factual data, and sponsored by the Institute of Pacific Relations as a scholarly "inquiry," should be replete with sentences such as these: "Unable, by their own admission, to come out as open opponents of the Soviet system because

the people had been won to the support of that system, the bourgeois nationalists could not prevent, but only retard, the development of Central Asia." (p. 118) Similarly, in the chapter entitled "History," the author traces briefly the historical development of the Soviet Far East from the point of view of the Party line. For instance, Mikhail Frunze is presented as the founder of the Red Army, but Leon Trotsky is not mentioned at all. It is also to be regretted that the author fails to refer to standard works on the subject such as The Economic Geography of Asia by Daniel R. Bergsmark.

A few maps and statistical tables are appended to the book.

CHARLES PRINCE

Indiana University

Newman, Bernard. The New Europe. New York, Macmillan, 1943. 568 pp. \$3.75.

It is an obvious truth that responsible citizenship, in a world so closely integrated politically and economically as our own, demands not only the maintenance of a constant interest in what may seem to be the affairs of other people, but also accurate and objective information. We have been irretrievably drawn into two successive world struggles which started in incidents or conditions apparently of but slight inherent interest to Americans, but which cost many thousand lives and enormous outlay.

With the aim of promoting an intelligent interest in post-war settlements and problems, Mr. Bernard Newman, the author of several travelogues, has written this book on Europe's probable future. Mr. Newman, over a period of years, visited every sore-spot and disputed area in Europe. On these journeys he often used a bicycle, but he wryly admits that although an excellent means for gleaning knowledge, this mode of travel would not be suitable for important and el-

derly statesmen.

His work is primarily an exposition of the always extremely delicate problem of postwar frontiers. He stresses the ethnic, military, historic, and even the sentimental factors involved, and, while not engaging to discuss the economic side, he is perforce compelled to touch upon certain economic aspects. Recognizing the extreme ethnic complexity of the problem, he advocates the shifting and transfer of populations to achieve a balance between ethnic and political factors. Where such a solution is impossible, he believes that plebiscites, justly and fairly conducted, will secure the desired aim, provided they are carried out in a less heated atmosphere than will prevail immediately after In his chapter on the the war. "Approach to the Problem" says: "In 1939 there were threequarters of a million Germans in Poland, and over a million Poles in Germany. There is no logical reason why their exchange should not be considered. Spread over a period of years, with detailed preparation and friendly and efficient supervision, the exchange of a couple of million people is not a great problem. Our forefathers would have thought little of it two thousand years ago. Life today is more complicated, and there are hundreds of difficulties-but none of them is insuperable. The cost would be that of one or two battleships.

According to Mr. Newman, the most critical area is in the eastern part of Europe, since the cleavage there between ethnic and political

frontiers is the greatest. In view of the long drawn out controversy between Poland and Russia over the eastern boundary question, still unsettled at this writing, his remarks are particularly appropriate if not entirely original. He justifies such transfer of population on the principle that the peace and welfare of Europe must not be subordinated to the convenience of the few. One can hardly quarrel with this idea, if there is adequate assurance that peace and stability would thus be assured.

W

fe

pr

ar

la

of

of

be

of

po

ď

ple

ye

fa

Sic

eig

ex

ma

Ge

ing

tai

Pa

est

pri

the

Co

A.

the

mi

an

of

Da

Mr. Newman's book, although somewhat drawn out is written with graciousness and good humor in an easy lecture-platform style. and the general reader will find much in it to think about. The Slavic scholar may be made uneasy by a few somewhat categorical judgments, unsupported by authoritative references, as, for instance, that Ruthenia is the cradle of the Slav race. The discussion of each problem is preceded by a short historical introduction and an exposition of the status before 1939, and concluded by a summary.

Mr. Newman is fully aware that on a topic so full of imponderables, historical events may either upset or justify an author's judgment. It is to be hoped that after the conclusion of hostilities a revised edition will contain the necessary material to clarify any new situation that may arise. On the whole, Mr. Newman's book is timely, interesting, and a reminder of the complex problems which need to be solved if Europe is to have happy and peaceful days ahead.

GEORGE WASKOVICH

Hunter College

Organization of American Relief in Europe 1918-1919: Including Negotiations Leading up to the Establishment of the Office of Director General of Relief at Paris by the Allied and Associated Powers. Documents selected and edited by Suda Lorena Bane and Ralph Haswell Lutz. (Hoover Library Publications, No. 20). Stanford University Press, 1943. 745 pp. \$6.00.

It sounds almost paradoxical that, with the second great Peace Conference of our century fast approaching, historical scholarship and present-day statesmanship still lack a comprehensive and firm documentary foundation for the study of the first Peace Conference, that of 1918-1919. It must be remembered that the original documents of the Peace Conference were deposited in the archives of the Quai d'Orsay where they remained completely inaccessible for twenty years. Nothing is known about their fate since the Germans took possession of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, although it is noteworthy that Germany has not made extensive use of captured diplomatic archives comparable with the German effort in that respect during World War I.

e,

h

5-

d

at

S,

et

It

n-

li-

a-

on

ſr.

st-

ex

lif

ce-

CH

Among the available documentary evidence connected with the Paris Peace Conference, the greatest and most valuable contribution so far has come from American private and official depositories (See the most up-to-date critical Peace Conference bibliography in Thomas A. Bailey's Woodrow Wilson and the Lost Peace, New York, Macmillan, 1944), such as the Wilson and Lansing papers, the archives of Col. Edward M. House and of David Hunter Miller and those of

the Department of State. To these now must be added documents of the Hoover Library at Stanford University—for, as the main topic of its present publications, the Hoover Library has appropriately chosen the period of transition from war to peace at the end of World War I. From the Library's inexhaustible store of primary source material, Miss Bane and Professor Lutz have selected for the present volume about 4400 documents illustrating the organization of American relief in Europe in 1918-1919. It must be underlined that the term "relief" is used here in a very broad sense. It includes not only "the relief front against famine," the primary purpose of the American Relief Administration, the Children's Relief Bureau, and the European Children's Fund, but also the work of the Allied Railway Mission, the European Technical Advisers' missions, the repatriation of prisoners of war, etc. On the other hand, documents dealing with the details of the organization of relief in various countries have not been included. In the opinion of the editors "at least a volume for each country" would be required for such a regional coverage. In view of the importance of these materials for the social and economic history of the various countries concerned, especially of the successor states of Imperial Russia and the Habsburg Monarchy during the early stages of their independence, it is to be hoped that they too will be published before long. As matters stand now, certain doubts might arise as to the border-line between the general and the more detailed material. It seems to the reviewer, for instance, that so important a communication as Hoover's proposal to President Wilson of "a Relief Commission for Russia" dated March 28, 1919, should have been included or at least mentioned.

The enlarged reprint of Herbert Hoover's article "We'll Have to Feed the World Again," published in Collier's at the end of 1942, serves as introduction to the volume and thus links the immense work accomplished a quarter of a century ago with the even greater task which will confront the UNRRA at the end of the present conflict. Of the four groups of 29 countries which received supplies in 1918-1919—"allied" countries, "neutral," "enemy," and "liberated" nations the last group with 98,000,000 people, with the exception of Belgium and Czechoslovakia, was wholly made up of Eastern European and Near Eastern nations, namely: Albania, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Finland, Poland, Armenia, Azerbaidjan, and Georgia. In addition to these areas, plans for relief work in Southern Russia and Syria were under discussion.

It is difficult to pick out pieces of most intrinsic value because the importance of this volume lies primarily in conveying an over-all picture of the truly chaotic conditions the representatives of the relief work had to face and did overcome. In most cases, political and relief problems were inseparably interwoven. This is why this collection touches upon a number of political problems of great diversity and thus has an outstanding value for a case study in Military Government. Among one of the conclusions which emerge from these documents is the necessity of dealing with Central Europe as an economic entity.

The chronological arrangement chosen by the editors is far from

being satisfactory. Although the editors express hope that the index and the table of contents will give a sufficient lead to readers interested in any particular operation, a topical arrangement would have been preferable, particularly in view of the fact that the present collection does not contain such very helpful explanatory summaries as one can find in the previous volumes of the Hoover Library Publications. Even identification of leading personalities has been omitted. For instance, in Col. Goodyear's report on the situation in Upper Silesia in August, 1919, not one name of the four high German officers participating in a conference is correct (p. 712). It should have been annotated: "General Groener (instead of von Groener), Chief-of-staff of the German Army, von Friedeburg (instead of Friederburg), Hoefer (instead of von Hoeffer) and von Passow (instead of von Pessow)." In the index the names appear also only in their distorted form.

V

sl

e

It

0

Cá

lis

A

is

of

th

an

ca

Re

lea

pr

a

Sic

en

A

de

bu

en

to

aga

the

ter

Se

off

"A

tion

jus

by

pet

the

and

era

the

fine

All

suc

mar

siar

pre

sup

no

into

cou

the

Such small errors, however, seem to be the only flaw in the otherwise traditionally excellent editorial and

printing achievement.

FRITZ T. EPSTEIN

Harvard College Library

STRAKHOVSKY, LEONID I. Intervention at Archangel. The Story of Allied Intervention and Russian Counter-Revolution in North Russia, 1918-1920. Princeton University Press, 1944. 336 pp. \$3.00.

This volume follows an earlier study by the author: The Origin of American Intervention in North Russia, 1918, published in 1937. With due attention to the larger political and diplomatic forces in-

volved, the study is focussed fairly sharply upon the actual course of events in and around Archangel. It offers a very detailed narrative of these events, and embodies a careful study not only of the published material but also of various American archives. Its main theme is the troubled course of existence of the Provisional Government of the Northern Region, a Socialist and anti-Bolshevik group, theoretically a part of the "Union for the Regeneration of Russia." Under the lead of Nicholas V. Chaikovsky, a prominent leader of the Union and a veteran revolutionary, the Provisional Government came into existence as the Allied fleet entered Archangel—late in July, 1918. Under the wing of the Allied forces, but with a good deal of independence of spirit, it pluckily attempted to organize the northern provinces against the growing Bolshevik authority,-but collapsed quickly after the Allied withdrawal, late in September 1919.

n

n

d

of

n

30

m

se

br

IN

n-

of

an

rth

on

pp.

ier

of

rth

37.

ger

in-

In his earlier volume, the author offers the following conclusion: "As a war manoeuvre the expedition to North Russia had its ample justification. . . It was agreed to by the United States only after a petition on the part of a portion of the Russian people themselves . . and in the end it benefited considerably the Soviet Government." In the present volume, likewise, he finds that the military purpose of Allied intervention "was eminently successful, since it checked German designs to use Northern Russian ports as submarine bases, and prevented a large amount of war supplies, which the Bolsheviks had no time to evacuate, from falling into German hands." This, of course, was the major purpose of the Archangel venture; and the author notes very properly that many writers on this subject "have minimized the German danger." Germany was actually preparing to send troops to the North — when the breakdown of the Western front prevented it.

It would perhaps have been better if a reminder of these basic facts had come at the beginning of this volume, instead of at the very end. The narrative of events at Archangel hardly suggests that there was a real war going on elsewhere, or that one result of this war was the liberation of Russia from the German menace.

The book is strikingly unpartisan in spirit, and gives the impression of scrupulous fairness. Captain Henry Le F. Hurt, R.N. who was in command of the Allied naval forces at Archangel in the summer of 1918, finds it a fair and accurate statement of events at that period, and considers it of real historical value. Captain Hurt also praises the conclusions summed up in the final pages. Among these we may cite the following: "The greatest tragedy lay in the fact that the Allied governments refused to deal with anyone who was not a bona fide democrat or even socialist, while the Russian officers, representing the real active element in the struggle, were overwhelmingly Therefore there was monarchist. from the beginning a real lack of understanding and of mutual confidence between the politicians of the Northern Region and the military command, from generals down to subaltern officers."

T. H. THOMAS

Cambridge, Mass.

FISHER, RAYMOND H. The Russian Fur Trade, 1550-1700. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1943. 275 pp. \$3.00.

Lantzeff, George V. Siberia in the Seventeenth Century: A Study of the Colonial Administration. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1943. 235 pp. \$2.75.

With interest in all things pertaining to Russia mounting as the war progresses, the timeliness of these two studies is self evident. Mere timeliness, however, is not all that makes these two monographs well worth reading.

Although the two works mutually complement one another they do not overlap in their subject matter, and from reading both of them, specific as each topic may be, one gets a broad panorama of an important epoch in Russia's past, namely a picture of the Russian advance into Siberia. As suggested by the titles, Dr. Fisher's book deals with the economic factors of Russia's expansion to the Pacific and Dr. Lantzeff's shows how the Russians established and maintained themselves within the colonial empire which they had acquired.

Dr. Fisher's excellent monograph shows to what extent the economic structure of the Muscovite state depended on the fur trade, domestic as well as foreign. Furs were to Russia what gold and silver were to Western Europe. Once the initial advance, by force of arms, into Siberia proved not only that furs were plentiful but also that natives could not cope with the superior military technique of the Russians, an elemental expansion into Siberia became inevitable. Although the con-

quest was originally impelled by private initiative (the Stroganovs and others), no sooner did it prove to be a paying venture than the state took control of the situation. Dr. Fisher shows that in the sixteenth century "chiefly through [her] fur trade" Russia was able to experience a "commercial renascence." And since it was largely her economic strength that enabled her to emerge intact from the critical Times of Trouble, the connection between the sixteenth and seventeenth century fur trade and modern Russia appears significant.

Dr. Lantzeff's monograph is an outstanding contribution to Russian historiography. As already mentioned above, it concerns itself not so much with the economic factors of Russia's advance into Siberia, as with her entrenchment in, and administration of her newly won colony. The reader may well be surprised to learn that already by the sixteenth century the Muscovite state had evolved a complex administrative system, which may very possibly have served as a starting point for subsequent administrative reforms. In the functions of the prikazes one can readily recognize a well-developed, fully operating bureaucratic system, which later produces the "Colleges" of Peter the Great, and still later, the administrative Departments, Ministries and Commissariats; and the sixteenth and seventeenth century hierarchy of government officials just as readily becomes transformed into the Petrian Table of Ranks. In Russia's expansion into Siberia the reader sees a picture resembling that of the Spanish conquests in America. The Russians, just like the Spaniards, were impelled by a desire to exploit the natural resources of a culturally backward amo ried freq their cont deta ficia dutie the arch

coun

ruth

forn such men othe conc

scho

an in

pans clear the and been tribu zeff two place Baki

clear past. Uniz

niko

tory

studi

AND and Yo \$2 Th

to w cated peopli in co prese

proce

country. But although the Russians ruthlessly wiped out opposition among the natives, they also curried the favor of the latter and frequently succeeded in enlisting their cooperation. An outstanding contribution of Dr. Lantzeff is his detailed analysis of the various officials and institutions with their duties, functions, and place within the Russian administrative hierarchy. Thanks to the definitive information that the book provides, such terms as prikaznaia izba, pismennyi golova, boiarskie deti, and others, stand out in bold relief as concrete beings and places.

In all, the two books present a scholarly (yet readable) account of an important phase of Russia's expansion and afford their readers a clearer insight into the workings of the Russian state of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries than has been heretofore possible. The contributions of Drs. Fisher and Lantzeff are of lasting merit, and their two monographs will take their place alongside those of Kulisher, Bakhrushin, Ogloblin, and Ogorodnikov. Anyone interested in the history of Russia will find these two studies indispensable in gaining a clearer understanding of Russia's

OLEG MASLENIKOV

University of California

n iot rs is ii-

rne

te

d-

гу

ıg

ve

ne

ze

ng

er

er

d-

is-

he

ry

als

ed

In

he

ng

in

ke

a

re-

rd

Anderson, Paul B. People, Church and State in Modern Russia. New York, Macmillan, 1944. 240 pp. \$2.50.

The purpose of the author is not to write a history of the complicated interrelation between the people, the State, and the Church in contemporary Russia, but "to present the religious element in the process of change within the whole

changing scheme, political, social, economic and philosophical." The method is the dialectic method of the Marxists. The author has chosen it because "by following the method of reasoning used by the Soviet citizens we can better understand how they arrive at their conclusions." There is no doubt that for the understanding of many decisions and statements made by the representatives of official Russia (not by the Soviet citizens at large) a command of the dialectic method is necessary. But whether the method should be used to understand the real social processes which have run in Russia under Communist rule, is another question. As Mr. Anderson applies it, it yields no greater result than the statement that situations and policies have many times changed, and that the individual changes have been explained by the Soviet leaders on the basis of their dialectic philosophy. This is true. But it is well known that, in Stalin's hands, the method has become an exceedingly simple tool to explain any error and change in policy: yesterday's policy is the thesis, the difficulties it produced is the antithesis, the new policy is the synthesis. The general perspective into

general perspective into which Mr. Anderson has placed "the three-cornered struggle" under investigation, in my opinion, is hardly correct. He virtually overlooks the general reversal of the trend which took place in 1934. Therefore, official statements made in the late thirties, according to which the Soviet State is merely in the stage of Socialism, not yet of Communism, are presented as expressing the victory of the new ideas over the inherited order of things, whereas, in actuality, they express the awareness of defeat and the necessity to proceed to a retreat. On the contrary, the high wave of religious persecution in 1937-38 is not recognized as such and is treated as an incident in the gradual liberalization of the régime. In general, Mr. Anderson is unwilling to speak of persecution, though once he makes this telling comparison: the attitude of the Soviet government towards the Church is like that of a gardener towards the weeds in his cabbage patch.

One is struck to find in the book statements like this: "Unfortunately the Patriarchal Church has held no Sobor [Council] since 1918." Only much later does the reader learn that no Sobor has taken place because the government did not grant the permission to convoke one. Somewhat strangely, the decay of the anti-religious movement is characterized as "a curious epoch of formalism." The recognition by the Moscow Patriarchate of the autocephaly of the Church of Georgia is mentioned in the midst of the discussion of events of the early twenties; the reader will hardly guess that the recognition in

question took place in 1943. Nevertheless, the book is a valuable contribution to the fascinating subject of religion in Soviet Russia. The author deserves especial gratitude for having reproduced quite a few important, but not easily accessible documents. He makes an excellent point in the last chapter showing that the annexations of the years 1939-40 have brought closer together the three major elements of Russian life, since the people ardently desired the reacquisition of the provinces lost in the turmoil of the Communist Revolution, and the Moscow Patriarchate was eager to recover

its jurisdiction over dioceses the separation of which it never had recognized.

N. S. TIMASHEFF

cl

pl

Ca

T

th

Si

or

th

"l

to

er

SO

R

be

tu

m

sh

or

tr

ve

bo

I,

to

fo

hi

sea

R

Se

ni

gie

ra

his

ga

the

So

Pa

H

gir

17

na

att

an

ha

tor

bo

na

Eu

leo

Fordham University

PARRY, ALBERT. Russian Cavalcade: A Military Record. New York, Washburn, 1944. 334 pp. \$3.50.

The author of this book is not a military expert, but he has written a lively account of Russia's military tradition. The story of the Russian Cavalcade is described with a keen appreciation of the national spirit, whether it be of the past or the present, and shows an admirably constructive imagination. The immortal character of Karataev in Tolstoy's War and Peace, who symbolizes the patience and heroic bearing of all suffering that war can impose upon humanity, taught Pierre Bezukhov "the faith in an ever-living, ever-manifest God." Mr. Parry follows somewhat the same lesson by dedicating this book not to individual heroes but to "the plain Russian soldier of all time," who, like Karataev, bears the suffering and carries the halo of victory modestly, unconsciously, without being aware of his heroism. This is a consoling thought to the reviewer who has always longed for such a tribute to the "grey coat" (seraya shinel')—the unknown soldier of Russia-who always died most bravely.

But has the author truly followed his set purpose to the end? Hardly, for a single glance at the contents reveals that at least half of the book deals with individual heros and "the lesser galaxy." This is somewhat disappointing to the reader's expectations aroused by the author's preface. It is equally regretable that the author did not

consider it necessary to devote a chapter to the Russian sailor who played his part nobly in Russia's cavalcade. Only the debacle at Tsushima is made reference to, but the general traditions of the Russian navy are either entirely omitted or scarcely mentioned. "The role of the Russian fleet," says Mr. Parry "has been only that of an auxiliary to the Russian army throughout the empire's history." This view is somewhat debatable. To be sure, the Russian navy dates only from the beginning of the eighteenth century; it is equally true that on many occasions the Russian sailor showed greater valor on land than on water, yet the navy has an illustrious record of her own glory. The very names which appear on the book-jacket, Leningrad, Sevastopol I, and Sevastopol II—are sufficient to erect a monument to the sailor for his skill and bravery as well as his adaptability to both land and sea. And what about such names of Russian naval men as Ushakov, Seniavin, Nakhimov, Lazarev, Kornilov, Istomin, Makarov, and a legion of others who profusely decorate the pages of Russian naval history? How about the naval engagements of Hangoe, Navarino, or the later exploits of Professor Otto Schmidt and Rear Admiral Papanin?

he

ad

ie:

rk,

50.

t a

ten

ary

ian

een

rit,

the

bly

im-

in

ym-

roic

war

ight

an

od."

the

ook

'the

ne,"

suf-

vic-

rith-

ism.

the

nged

oat"

sol-

died

wed

rdly,

tents

the

roes

15 15

ead-

the

re-

not

The first part of the book, "The Heroes of Yore," appropriately begins with the capture of Berlin in 1760 by the Russian army. Two national heroes are given particular attention in this chapter: Suvorov and Kutuzov, both of whom are hardly mentioned in military history books outside of Russia. Yet both Suvorov and Kutuzov are names closely linked with Western European history, with the Napoleonic era.

The other two parts deal with the developments since the Revolution. Here perhaps the most interesting is the chapter devoted to "The God of War and Moving Forts," particularly the section on Russian artillery. The chapter on the Red cavalry, "Horsemen of the Steppe," is equally admirable, and the reader will find some fascinating sidelights on the rôle of the horseman in modern warfare. On the other hand, the part dealing with the heroes (or fallen heroes) of the Red Army is full of assumptions and hypotheses. Realizing the total absence of reliable evidence to support any interpretation of such highly controversial subjects as the notorious trials or the puzzling figure of Tukhachevsky, the author moves cautiously and warns his reader repeatedly that "only history will tell." But then he proceeds to tell it anyhow. Reading this account one becomes more aware of the scarcity of evidence in regard to the leaders of the Red Army or its strategy, its equipment or policy, its source of hidden strength or talent whence recent victories have emanated. After closing the book one is still apt to ask: how did these soldiers of the people come to the fore? Who were the leaders of the Red Army only yesterday, and how did they come to bear the titles of marshals, generals or what not today? The answers to these pertinent questions are not to be found in Mr. Parry's book, nor could they be given at present, for only "history will tell." Meanwhile the insatiable curiosity and thirst for an understanding of the "riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma" is stronger than ever, and Mr. Parry's Cavalcade will temporarily serve to satisfy this need. There will be room left, however, for the future historian to supplement this fascinating story with later revelations which will explain the rôle the Revolution and the Red Army played in this world drama of ours today.

ANATOLE G. MAZOUR

University of Nevada

KAIDANOVA, OLGA. Ocherki po istorii narodnogo obrazovaniya v Rossii i SSSR. [Studies in the History of Public Education in Russia and USSR]. Vol. I [Canada], 1938. 534 pp.

The publication of the first volume of this history of Russian education, covering the pre-revolutionary period, has attracted little attention. But the scope of material covered, the extensive historical research and the wealth of personal recollections and experiences should make the work interesting to anyone who is interested in the development of Russian education. It is admirably calculated to dispel the propagandist illusion that Russia before the Revolution was a cultural howling wilderness. The author, now living in Canada, is a veteran Russian educator, with a teaching experience extending over the period 1885-1930. So she was personally associated with the theories, movements and educators she describes.

The author discusses the government-supported schools, where the methods of teaching were usually dry, rigid, and formal. But she devotes still more attention to the other type of school, more truly public, opened, and sustained through the initiative and public spirit of Zemstvos, co-operatives and other private organizations and individuals, to which thousands of educated Russians gave years of

selfless devotion and enthusiasm for the cause of educating the masses,

These schools, for children and adults, were of many various types. Schools were set up in prisons. There were primary courses for peasants and their children in forlorn villages where the teachers were sometimes almost literally buried in the impassable mud of the country roads of those days, without books, friends, music, or other cultural recreations. Factory schools for workers, Sunday schools for employees and servants, clubs, libraries, "people's homes" sprang up throughout the country.

Because these schools were opened through private initiative, they were in the van with their progressive and experimental methods and often pushed the government schools to adopt reforms. The relations between teachers and pupils were intimate and personal. The author relates instances when dying pupils in the villages asked to see their teachers; she quotes from the diaries of teachers who spoke of their work with a kind of passion-

ate evangelical faith.

Because of this effort, the half century that preceded the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia witnessed the transition from an almost completely illiterate population to a general literacy of over 30%, some provinces leading with 50%. Compulsory elementary education was introduced in the larger cities; there were over eight million pupils in schools of various types; there were 25,000 public libraries. Count Leo Tolstoy took the lead in a movement to publish simple books on a variety of literary and educational subjects which the barely literate masses could and would read. These little books were sold at about a penny apiece.

tion and Thi an o

1

the

Pin

teri

KAI E

who him

in r

lar' com mai Bef say: him dica

ame

rep ceiv Rus stuc by per ver

the Lat Pro era ges

fun civi trai There are excellent sketches of the "giants" of Russian education, Pirogov, Ushinsky, Korff, characteristically persecuted by the reactionary bureaucracy but admired and followed by many teachers. This work can be recommended as an excellent reference book on Russian education.

WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN Cambridge, Mass.

KAUN, ALEXANDER AND SIMMONS, ERNEST J., editors. Slavic Studies; Sixteen Essays in Honor of George Noyes. Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1943. 242 pp. \$3.00.

The friends of Professor Noyes who have joined to pay tribute to him in this volume have succeeded in reflecting that distinguished scholar's wide range of interests and accomplishments in a book of permanent value for Slavic students. Before so rich a collection of essays the reviewer must content himself with providing a simple indication of what is to be found among them, in the certainty that here is something for every taste.

Russian studies have the largest representation, and Lermontov receives the most attention among Russian writers. Alexander Kaun's study of the "poet of nostalgia," by its sensitive treatment of the persistent themes in Lermontov's verse, brings out that special and curious unity that is perhaps the most important single feature of the poet's lyric production. Henry Lanz places the Demon in the Promethean cycle of European literature and adds some very suggestive reflections on the closely related Manichaean heresy and its function in the development of our civilization. Dorothea Prall Radin's translation of Pesnya pro Tsarya

Ivana Vasilyevicha will undoubtedly become our standard one. Although the original verse form is not particularly rewarding in English (I do not suggest that a better one might have been chosen), Mrs. Radin maintains the high level of workmanship that puts all her translations in the very first class.

It is particularly fitting that, in a book dedicated to a great teacher, a large amount of the material should hold as much interest for the non-specialist as for the Slavist. Clarence Manning's study of time in the Russian novel, for example, is a stimulating lesson in the application of careful scholarship to problems of literary criticism. Starting from the contradictions in the chronology of Rudin, the author is able to make clear some of the most distinctive features of the Russian novel between Gogol and the Neo-Romantics. It is to be hoped that he will give us further studies of this rewarding problem. With equal effect J. A. Posin compares Belinsky's criticism of Pushkin and Eugene Onegin with Pisarev's to illustrate the differences — and the underlying agreement-between the two critics and their epochs. George Patrick treats the relative independence of Ostrovsky in the quarrels of the Slavophils and Westerners, and Nikander Strelsky continues his investigations of Saltykov with a new and convincing interpretation of the sixth chapter of Bygone Days in Poshekhonye. Ernest Simmons' contribution on the writing of War and Peace will whet the reader's appetite for his forthcoming biography of Tolstoy.

It is interesting to note that the two essays concerned with Polish culture treat their subject in relation to Russia. In fact, Waclaw Lednicki's charming and avowedly experimental article on Mickiewicz, Dostoevsky, and Blok is first of all a study of the Polish scar on the Russian conscience. Arthur Coleman writes of the maturing effect of the South Russian journey on Mickiewicz's work and illustrates his thesis with many of his own excellent translations.

Czech studies are represented by René Wellek's article on "the two traditions of Czech literature," in which sympathetic attention is directed to comparatively neglected periods of Czech literary development. The essay is written with a sure hand and includes an amazingly large amount of both information and interpretation in a small space. Alfred Senn contributes some notes on Lithuanian religious practices which are interesting both for their intrinsic value and for the light they cast on the cultural history of Lithuania.

Oliver Elton, with a graceful translation from Mileta Jaksic, and Sir Bernard Pares, with an affectionate foreword to the volume, pay Britain's tribute. A biographical sketch and a bibliography of Professor Noyes' writings, prepared by Oleg Maslenikov with the aid of Mrs. Behrens, make an appropriate conclusion to the volume. The reader will be grateful also for the frontispiece portrait by Valeria Kaun.

To many the most precious pages in this book will be those two containing the concise, sober, and generous appreciation of Professor Noyes' work, contributed by another distinguished leader of Slavic studies in this country, the late Samuel N. Harper.

F. J. WHITFIELD The Society of Fellows, Harvard University BLACK, C. E. The Establishment of Constitutional Government in Bulgaria. Princeton University Press, 1943. 344 pp. \$3.75, future

C.

Estab

Gover

the ex

tion.

his ta

of the

but a

histor

abilit

vant

avoid

later

depri

many

tion :

is tha

an a

view

in th

cially

fluen

mou

shor

vote

garia

witn

slav

fore

ing

Tirr

mos

cons

in t

subi

Bul

Mo

the

sup

gari

who

to

mat

Qui

nes

for

13 1

gov

T

Within the past sixty-six years, that is within the memory of an octagenarian, Bulgaria passed through many vicissitudes. It was freed by Russian arms from almost five hundred years of Turkish overlordship, by the treaty of San Stefano, with a territory as large as it had held under its great Tsar Simeon I. It was deprived of this territory and confined to the small region between the Balkan range and the Danube river by the Congress of Berlin. The country received and accepted from the Tsarist government one of the most liberal constitutions and a German prince. It acquired East Rumelia and exchanged one German prince for another. Bulgaria, now a Kingdom, fought the first Balkan war against Turkey for the possession of Thrace and Macedonia, thus aiming at the restoration of Simeon's empire and the fulfilment of the terms of the treaty of San Stefano. In the second Balkan war against Serbia and Greece, Bulgaria tried to secure these gains, but lost almost all of them. The World War saw Bulgaria on the side of Germany, Austria, and Turkey, and in control of large parts of Macedonia. In the period between 1919 and 1935, the country changed from agrarian socialist to military fascist governments, and finally joined Germany again in this war. Throughout these years of glory and defeat, the Bulgarian people have enjoyed only short periods of comparatively free government, but they have retained the Tirnovo constitution as a sacred inheritance and as a promise for the future.

t of

sity

ars,

an

sed

Was

ost

er-

Ste-

as sar

this

nall

nge

on-

re-

ar-

ost

nan

elia

nce

ng-

var

ion

hus

ne-

of

San

can

ece,

ns,

he

the

ind

rge

iod

try

to

ind

in

of

ian

pe-

OV-

he

in-

the

C. E. Black's monograph, The Establishment of Constitutional Government in Bulgaria, deals with the early history of this constitution. The author is well qualified for his task not only by his knowledge of the country and of its language, but also by his remarkable sense of historical objectivity, and by his ability to concentrate on the relevant problems. He goes so far as to avoid carefully all references to the later fortunes of Bulgaria, and thus deprives himself and his book of many a tempting and timely deduction and generalization. His attitude is that of a scholar, and his book is an admirable piece of scholarship.

The readers of The Russian Review will be particularly interested in the part played by Russia, especially at a time when Russian influence in the Balkans is steadily mounting. Only a comparatively short chapter (pp. 142-148) is devoted to "Russia's Policies in Bulgaria," but the whole volume bears witness to the rise and fall of Panslavism as an instrument of Russian foreign policy. The most interesting aspect of Russia's part in the Tirnovo constitution is the fact that most of the liberal features of this constitution are already contained in the Organic Statute as it was submitted by the Russians to the Bulgarian National Assembly. Moreover, in the years to follow, the Tsarist government quite often supported the Liberal Party in Bulgaria rather than the Conservatives whose views came obviously closer to those held by the Russians in matters of their own internal policy. Quite recently we were able to witness a similar tendency in Russian foreign policy. It seems that Russia is interested in establishing friendly. governments in the nations living along her borders rather than in forcing communist or Soviet ideas

upon them.

The most interesting aspect of Black's book, at least to the general reader, is the text of the constitution itself, and the discussion of the degree to which it was put in force, both in the period covered by the monograph, and in later years. American readers will notice that the Tirnovo constitution bears not the faintest resemblance to the constitution of the United States. legislative, the executive, and the judicial powers are not separated, but are either reserved to the monarch (executive and judicial), or shared by him with the National Assembly (legislative). Thus the famous balance of powers, which is, at least in theory, one of the foundations of our Republic, is absent from the Bulgarian constitu-The other philosophical concept which, latently, is present in American political thought, the idea of the mixed constitution combining monarchic (President), aristocratic (Senate), and democratic (House) elements, was also originally absent from the Bulgarian constitution which dispensed with an upper house. Later, it was temporarily added to the constitution, but neither in Bulgaria nor in the United States, or for that matter in France, did it obtain the aristocratic character which it had in Rome and England whence it was derived.

Black's careful account of the first few elections which took place in Bulgaria shows clearly that the newly gained liberties changed little in the character of Bulgarian society. Only part of the population could fulfill the requirements of literacy, and only a small proportion of those qualified

did actually vote. In spite of all these difficulties, the National Assembly was representative of the Bulgarian people. It lacked, however, the political experience necessary for legislative action, and it was only rarely given an opportunity to fulfill its duties. Most of its time was spent in futile internal struggles, in differences with the government, and in preparation for new elections which were held as often as the government and the prince thought it advantageous.

To sum up, Bulgaria was not so fortunate as to have Founding Fathers like those men who watched over the first steps of the young American state, nor was she left in peace to develop her own way of life by trial and error as the United States, far removed from the broils of Europe, could do. After nearly seventy years of "independence, Bulgaria can still look forward to self-government. Education and industrial development will help greatly. The experience of Bulgaria indicates that liberty can neither be granted nor can it be guaranteed by a constitution.

A. E. RAUBITSCHEK

The American School of Classical Studies at Athens Princeton, New Jersey

BODMER, FREDERICK. The Loom of Language. Lancelot Hogben, ed. New York, Norton, 1944. 692 pp. \$3.75.

Mr. Bodmer's Loom of Language is a book that can be read with profit. However, my purpose is not to dwell on its virtues, but rather to take exception to the unsatisfactory treatment of the Slavic languages, included in a chapter entitled, somewhat quaintly, "The diseases of Language."

To understand Mr. Bodmer's position, we must keep in mind that he is primarily interested in furthering international understanding by promoting the study of languages in general, and that of an auxiliary world language in particular. Now this laudable goal leads Mr. Bodmer to strange excesses. Consumed with the desire to make language-learning easy, he slights those tongues which are difficult to the English-speaking person, either because they are less closely related to English, or are more highly inflected. As a result, there arises something like a classification into "good" languages and "bad" languages.

P

m

cc

E

ca

by

C

sia

be

di

ch

cr

te

to

he

TI

ma

Gı

T

na

ph

501

co

M

ger

15

lan

sin

ple

tee

by

ava

me

bet

dis

Ru

ter

sia

to

to :

the

eco

tern

hap

the

sho

ian

Though Mr. Bodmer recognizes the importance of the Russian language and of the civilization of those who speak it, he feels that Russian is a "bad" language: "the grammatical intricacies" of Russian force him to acknowledge that he cannot help the would-be learner. True, the Russian language cannot be analyzed in the four pages the author devotes to it. If Mr. Bodmer had only given it more space, and exercised the ingenuity he shows in dealing with the Germanic and Romance languages, he would not have found, to cite just one instance, that "the irregularities of adjectival behavior make those of Latin fade into insignificance" (p. 419). Actually, there are only two main types of attributive adjectives, the "hard" and the "soft." Four other classes are merely combinations or variants of the first two, and are easily recognizable as such. Of the remaining two, one is identical with the "soft declension except for an added "soft" sign, while the last one is a combination of the usual "hard" adjective and noun declensions. The predicative form, which Mr. Bodmer notes particularly, is quite simple, for it is always used in the While this is a nominative case. complex system compared with English, experience shows that it can be memorized in a few hours

by an average student.

f

at

at

۲.

ot

ne

đ-

e,

he

r-

he

ist

ri-

ke

ifi-

ere

u-

he

are

of

og-

ing

ft"

ded

s a

rd"

The

Another Bodmer bogey is the Cyrillic alphabet in which the Russian language is written. The alphabet is described as a "cultural handicap" and "a hangover from [a] church-ridden past," yet the only criticism given is that it is not "internationally current." Is it the editor, the impish Mr. Hogben, who here got completely out of hand? The Cyrillic alphabet, like its Roman cousin, was derived from the Greek, and is not difficult to learn. The most important consideration, namely, whether this particular alphabet is adequate to represent the sounds of the languages it must record, is not even mentioned. That Mr. Bodmer is well aware of the general problem involved, however, is clear; he notes that the English language has at least twenty-two simple consonants and twelve simple vowels, for which only seventeen and nve letters (supplemented by "w" and "y") respectively, are available (p. 42-43). Had Mr. Bodmer considered the Cyrillic alphabet in that light, he would have discovered that in this respect the Russian language is distinctly better off than the Engish. The Russians do not have to have recourse to combinations like "ch" and "sh" to represent simple consonants, and the palatalization of consonants is economically represented by an alternate set of vowels. What would happen if Russian were written in the Roman alphabet is clearly shown by Polish, Czech, and Croatian. In these Slavic languages dia-

critical marks and combinations of letters represent many sounds, and palatalization must be indicated by a separate symbol, a

cumbrous method at best.

In addition, Mr. Bodmer's analysis contains a number of factual inaccuracies. Russian was a written language long before the end of the eighteenth century (p. 418). While it is true that loan words from the West began to appear comparatively late, it is not true that the great change has taken place only since the recent intensified industrialization of the Soviet Union (p. 419): the eighteenth century was the period of wholesale borrowing. In this connection, comparison of the vocabulary of Petrov's Dictionary of Loan Words (in Russian), 2nd edition, 1942, with any large pre-revolutionary dictionary is illuminating. In giving what Mr. Bodmer calls the evidence (p. 420), he comments on the "wasteful luxuriance of verb forms." This suggests that he does not recognize the fact that the aspects of the Russian verb convey certain meanings. Yet his own examples show that he does: for instance, if "ya pisal means I was writing, and ya napisal means I have written," it is evident that the prefix na conveys an idea, and therefore is not wasted. "Lushje" should have been transliterated as luchshe (p. 420). "Russian [Russia?] has always been, and still remains, a Tower of Babel," Mr. Bodmer writes, and then continues, "The situation is deplorable enough if we confine ourselves to the three Russian languages." Yet his only comment is that they are "separated by such small differences that they are mutually intelligible" (p. 421). This does not seem to be a calamity. Elsewhere Mr. Bodmer is not entirely up to date. Pleading for the international adoption of the Roman alphabet, he quotes Lenin's words to the president of the Central Pan-Soviet Committee of National Alphabets: "Romanization, there lies the great revolution of the East" (p. 75). This trend has now been arrested; several of the languages of the minor nationalities of the Soviet Union which had been equipped with Roman alphabets have more recently been changed over to the Cyrillic.

Errors of fact inevitably lead to errors in generalization. Mr. Bodmer makes light of one argument for language study for literary purposes on the ground that cheap translations of fiction and drama are plentiful. I doubt that the general level of translations available is high enough to justify such a conclusion. It certainly is not true of translations from the Russian, though the situation is improving somewhat. Moreover, Mr. Bodmer does not mention poetry, which is seldom adequately translated (p.5).

A greater awareness of the facts in the field of Slavic languages would have enabled Mr. Bodmer to avoid another dubious generalization, that the popular speech is generally less highly inflected than the language of the educated (p. 96). This is emphatically not true of the Slavic languages. Colloquial Russian, for instance, differs in many respects from the language of literature and science, but not to the extent of inflection. sians, at least, do not have to spend "a large part of [their] intellectual energy" in the pursuit of grammatical studies, for they unconsciously learn the flexions in childhood. Mr. Bodmer has done the cause of language study and international understanding a distinct disservice by his persistence in attempting to bridge the gaps between the various languages without always first evaluating them from the point of view of the native speakers.

te

n

a

0

h

r

Iı

in

fu

ti

pl

at

in

in pa

m

an

in

K

co

ler

no

be

mu

ko

геа

kn

gre

the

has Ho

mi

acc

ria

has

wh

Tcl

gui

han

er's

ly

Was

PETER A. PERTZOFF
Cornell University

ZETLIN, M. O. Pyatero i drugie [The Five and Others]. New York, Novyi Zhurnal, 1944. 398 pp. \$2.75.

Weinstock, Herbert. Tchaikovsky. New York, Knopf, 1943. 386 pp. \$5.00.

Seroff, V. I. Dmitri Shostakovich. New York, Knopf, 1943. 260 pp. \$3.00.

Mr. Zetlin's volume forms a pleasing exception among books on music. It reads like an adventure story. It is true that these Five had many "adventures" and any skillful telling of them cannot help but interest the reader, but, on the other hand, such a subject presents certain dangers to a writer who is not a musician. He cannot limit himself to a mere description of events and personalities, and it is difficult for him to enter into the spirit of a profession in which he is a stranger. As a rule such attempts have ended in failure. Mr. Zetlin, however, has acquitted himself of his task most successfully. His book, first of all, has an outstanding literary value— it is written in excellent Russian prose. At the same time, it is not a biographie romancée-a genre that was so popular about fifteen years ago-and it is based on established historical facts. In a clear and vivid narrative, the author has told the story of the complicated and at times painful relations between the great founders of the national school of Russian music. He has

succeeded not only in giving a masterful portrayal of the "heroes," but also in reproducing the general musical atmosphere of the period and in showing the intimate process of the birth of musical works. He has done this with great tact and

understanding.

n

ıd

ul

n-

er

T-

ot

m-

nts

ult

fa

er.

led

has

ost

all,

e-

sian

ot a

that

ears

hed

ivid

the

1 at

the

nal

has

The author's treatment of his heroes is an unusually objective one. In his book they all appear as having been equally right. Each has fulfilled that for which he was destined and each has found his own place in history. With this objective attitude I do not find myself always in agreement. The epoch dealt with in the book is now a thing of the past, but at its end two figures remain facing history, with the conflict between them still unsolved and unreconciled. Both in art and in life, Musorgsky and Rimsky-Korsakov were incompatible. Mr. Zetlin tries to reconcile them by blunting edges and minimizing contradictions. And yet the problems of their relationship is still not settled, and its solution will be one of the tasks of the Russian music of the future.

Mr. Weinstock's book on Tchaikovsky, written with the general reader in view, shows a good knowledge of the literature on the great Russian composer, including the latest biographical material that has been published in Soviet Russia. However, the book leaves me with mixed feelings. Mr. Weinstock has accumulated much valuable material on the life of Tchaikovsky and has provided the American reader, who is not so well acquainted with Tchaikovsky the man, with a good guide on the subject. On the other hand, his criticism of the composer's form and style, which frequently occurs in spite of the author's warning that "this is a biography,

not a critical study," is none too convincing. There is no space here for a detailed discussion of this subject. I shall say only that criticism of Tchaikovsky's form should not be made from an abstract or scholastic point of view and that, first of all, one should take him as he is, with his own unique timbre of voice and his individual peculiarities. Besides, it should be re-membered that the estimate of Tchaikovsky has gone through three successive stages. The first was during the life of the composer; the second, shortly after his death when, with the development of modernism, his importance began to wane; and the third, after the First World War, when his rehabilitation took place. Mr. Weinstock's volume gives me the impression of stopping at the first stage.

Mr. Seroff's book on Schostakovich does not go beyond mere information. It gives too many details on the young composer's family, including his grandfather, aunts and sisters, but very little on Schostakovich's music. When writing about such a young composer one can hardly put the emphasis on his biography, which strictly speaking does not yet exist. One should concentrate on the essence of his musical art, and this is, unfortunately, what I miss in Mr. Seroff's book. The most interesting problem in Schostakovich's life is his transformation from a modernist into a "populist" composer, tending towards simplification. And again this is interesting not from the biographical point of view. After all we know enough about the "Lady Macbeth" episode, the temporary ostracism of which the composer became the victim, and his subsequent rehabilitation. What is of interest is how his "conversion" has

occurred in the musical sense, that is to say, how it affects the very process of his musical thinking and what musical forms it takes. On this Mr. Seroff's book is silent.

ARTHUR LOURIE

New York City

ALMEDINGEN, MARTHA. Frossia. York, Harcourt - Brace, 1944. 358 pp. \$2.50.

CARR, ROBERT SPENCER. The Bells of Saint Ivan's. New York, Appleton-Century, 1944. 136 pp. \$2.00.

Russia's revolutionary years are an inexhaustible theme for the historian and for the psychologist, and will remain so for many years to come. But, as Mrs. Almedingen puts it: ". . . people will write profound books about the civil war, and the economic upheaval, and this and that and the other, vast, grand topics all of those, and few will ever know that the absolutely unimportant people had their lives to live, and lived them somehow, anyhow, and did some work, and never really cursed anyone or anything."

Frossia is a book about unimportant people, and about their important experience, for these people have stood the acid test of a common tragedy and of individual suffering. It is a book about a girl, who passionately wanted to live and to survive the tragedy and her own suffering. Yet Frossia did not seek the protection of selfish indifference, nor the shield of a stoical attitude. She learned to live in the terrifying world of revolution, sharing the great ordeal with others, with the simple folk around her, some good, some bad, and the link that tied her to them was a

link of sympathy and understanding, which makes her story profoundly human.

thi

wh

gui

the

old

on

sha

tua

bol

odo

tort

the

writ

of a

F

Sair

Frossia is also a book about a great city in the grip of revolution and hunger, and the Petersburg depicted by Mrs. Almedingen forms a majestic and dramatic background. For those who are familiar with Russia's former capital, it is a strangely moving picture, with the marble palaces and sweeping avenues, the mighty river and the many bridges, and the suburbs and working districts shrouded in the winter mists. But even to those who do not know Petersburg, the book will convey something of the city's unique atmosphere and beauty.

There is much that we should like to quote from Frossia, because this is not only the story of a girl and her struggles in a world where it was difficult to survive; it is also a whole philosophy of life, expressed in simple terms, gentle as is the wisdom of the Russian people. And there is one keynote to this philosophy, — a love, deeper than wisdom: the love of man, the love of Russia, which, as Frossia describes it, is "in her bones and in her prayers."

The Bells of Saint Ivan's seems to echo this note of gentleness and good will sounded in Frossia. Yet Robert Spencer Carr is no sentimentalist, and there is a certain dry humor in his book which is an anticlimax to the dramatic experience of the narrator. The world described by Carr is not the grim world of revolution and civil war pictured by Mrs. Almedingen. It is the world of Russia today, of Russia at war, seen through the eyes of a young American stranded in a little village on the Volga under enemy fire.

There is much vivid realism in this book, but the casual tone in which it is written only half disguises the suppressed emotion of the lonely traveller revisiting the old church of Saint Ivan's perched on the steep bluff above the Volga. As he beholds the sky-blue, onionshaped domes of the ancient sanctuary, he recognizes it as the symbol of "the undying Russian Orthodox Church that heaves itself in tortured rainbow bubbles out of the blood-soaked Russian earth to writhe toward heaven in an agony of adoring architecture."

h

le

d

ie

se

le

1e d ld se rl re **SO** Xas 0to er he sia nd ms nd let. ntiiry an errld rim var t is usyes in der Father Gregory, the priest of Saint Ivan's, is perhaps also a sym-

bol of the undying spirit of Russia. But he is not a painted figure, He is intensely alive and human, infinitely wise. And there is a beautiful description of the inside of the church, stacked with grain, which the peasants have brought to Saint Ivan's in order to save from destruction the seed of future harvests.

In both these books about Russia, there is hope, stronger than suffering, expressed by two authors who know that suffering leads the Russian people to resurrection.

HELEN ISWOLSKY

New York City

NEW BOOKS RECEIVED

BERGSON, ABRAM, The Structure of Soviet Wages. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press, 1944 (Harvard Economic Studies 76), pp. 255. \$3.50.

ar

sic

- CARDWELL, ANN SU, Poland and Russia; The Last Quarter Century. New York, Sheed & Ward, 1944. pp. 251. \$2.75.
- CRESSEY, GEORGE B., Asia's Lands and Peoples. New York & London, McGraw-Hill, 1944. pp. 608. \$6.00.
- DANZAS, Yu N., Katolicheskoe Bogopoznanie i Marksistskoe Bezbozhie (The Catholic Knowledge of God and the Marxist Godlessness). Rome, 1941.
- DOROSH, HARRY, Russian Constitutionalism. New York, Exposition Press, 1944. pp. 127. \$2.50.
- EDELSTADT, VERA, Young Fighters of the Soviet. New York, Knopf, 1944. pp. 104. \$2.00.
- HYDE, NINA VERHOVSKOY and FILLMORE HYDE, Russia Then and Always. New York, Coward-McCann, 1944. pp. 331. \$3.00.
- MANNING, CLARENCE A., Ukrainian Literature; Studies of The Leading Authors. Jersey City, N. J., Ukrainian National Association, 1944. pp. 126.
- NABOKOV, VLADIMIR, Nikolai Gogol. Norfolk, Conn., New Directions Books, 1944. pp. 172. \$1.50.
- NAZAROFF, ALEXANDER, The Land of the Russian People. New York, Lippincott, 1944. \$2.00.
- PARES, Sir BERNARD, A History of Russia, 4th ed. rev. New York, Knopf, 1944. pp. 575.
- Von GRONICKA, ANDRE, Henry von Heiseler, A Russo-German Writer. New York, Morningside Heights, King's Crown Press, 1944. (No. 16 of the Columbia University Germanic Studies). pp. 224.
- WERTH, ALEXANDER, Leningrad. New York, Knopf, 1944. pp. 189. \$2.50.
- WHITE, WILLIAM C., Made in the USSR. New York, Knopf, 1944. pp. 159. \$2.00.

ERRATA

The following errors have crept into the text of Eugene Raitch's article Pushkin's Ode to the Old School Tie, Vol. III, No. 2 of The Russian Review:

Page	Line	Printed	Should Read
78	3	October 17	October 19
79	12	line	Line
79	14	by Oceans	but Ocean's

n

f,

en

he m,

ec-

ew

rk,

nan 144.

189.

944.



JUMPER

THE LIFE OF A SIBERIAN HORSE By

NICHOLAS KALASHNIKOFF

This captivating story about a real Siberian horse will rank with "Smoky and "Black Beauty" as one of the greatest horse stories of all time. The author who knew the horse and the country where he lived, has written with fidelity and rare understanding of Jumper's life on the little farm near Lake Bails in the wild Siberian forest, and during the difficult days of the War. Illustrate in black and white by Edward Shenton. \$2.5

at all bookstores

Charles Scribner's Son

PITMAN TEXTS

RUSSIAN TRADE AND INDUSTRY — Geography, History, Economy, Sociology (Reader) V. G. Olkhovsky

65 pp. \$2.00

ELEMENTARY GUIDE TO RUSSIAN PRONUNCIATION. G. R. Noyes & G. Z. Patrick 58 pp. \$.85

Bondar's SIMPLIFIED RUSSIAN METHOD (Conversational and Commercial) 6th Ed., Rev. 325 pp. \$2.50

ELEMENTARY RUSSIAN READER. G. Z. Patrick 167 pp. \$1.20

ADVANCED RUSSIAN READER. G. Z. Patrick 262 pp. ELEMENTARY SCIENTIFIC RUSSIAN READER (complete vocabulary) G. A. Znamensky 116 pp. \$1.5

ROOTS OF THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE, G. Z. Patrick (Elementary Guide to Russian Word-Building)

240 pp. \$1.50 RUSSIAN IDIOMS AND

RUSSIAN IDIOMS AND PHRASES. Louis Segal

46 pp. \$.75
BORIS GODUNOV (Pushkin) A
Segal Reader, 2nd Ed.
167 pp. \$1.00

FIRST RUSSIAN READER and SECOND RUSSIAN READER by Louis Segal Each \$.60

Bondar's RUSSIAN READERS No. 1. Queen of Spades \$.85 2. Humorous Stories .85

Pitman Publishing Corporation

\$1.50

2 West 45 St., New York 19

205 W. Monroe, Chicago 6